arXiv:math/0009087v1 [math.LO] 8 Sep 2000

On $\lhd^*$-maximality

Mirna Džamonja
School of Mathematics
University of East Anglia
Norwich, NR4 7TJ,UK
M.Dzamonja@uea.ac.uk
http://www.mth.uea.ac.uk/people/md.html
and
Saharon Shelah
Mathematics Department
Hebrew University of Jerusalem
91904 Givat Ram, Israel
shelah@sunset.huji.ac.il
http://math.rutgers.edu/≈shelarch

February 1, 2008

Abstract

This paper investigates a connection between the ordering $\lhd^*$ among theories in model theory and the (N)SOP$_n$ hierarchy of Shelah. It introduces two properties which are natural extensions of this hierarchy, called SOP$_2$ and SOP$_1$, and gives a connection between SOP$_1$ and the maximality in the $\lhd^*$-ordering. Together with the known results about the connection between the (N)SOP$_n$ hierarchy and the existence of universal models in the absence of GCH, the paper provides a step toward the classification of unstable theories without the strict order property. [1]

---

[1] This publication is numbered 692 in the list of publications of Saharon Shelah. The authors thank the United-States Israel Binational Science Foundation for their support

0 Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to investigate a question raised in S.Shelah's paper [Sh 500], which asks which first order theories are maximal in the $\triangleleft^*$-ordering, and the connection of this question with the NSOP hierarchy introduced in that paper. The exact definitions of these notions are to be given below, but for the moment let us just say that that the purpose of both is to measure relative "complicatedness" of one theory versus another, and our question is how these two measures compare. Our results show that in both of these orders, the theory of a dense linear order, is strictly above the theory of infinitely many independent equivalence relations. The significance of this particular theory is that it is the prototype of a theory which is not simple, but it is just a bit more complicated: it is NSOP_3. This shows that non-simple theories are not necessarily $\triangleleft^*$-maximal. The hierarchy of $\mathrm{(N)SOP}_n$ for $n \geq 3$ was defined by S.Shelah in [Sh 500], as an attempt to classify the unstable theories without strict order property into countably many classes, "increasing in difficulty" to the theory of a dense linear order. From the definitions in that paper, it is not obvious how one might extend this hierarchy on the lower side of it, to define properties which would take place of SOP_2 and SOP_1 for example. This paper gives a definition of two properties which do exactly that. Together with the results on the existence of universal models, in [Sh 500] and elsewhere, this paper gives evidence that the ideas of the $\mathrm{(N)SOP}_n$ hierarchy might be at least a good approximation to what is needed in the desired classification. This paper extends the $\mathrm{(N)SOP}_n$ hierarchy by considering further properties close to the lower end of the hierarchy. The order $\triangleleft^*$ is related to the Keisler ordering of theories, but here we do not concentrate on that connection. Further results in the direction investigated by this paper will be presented

---

through grant numbered and the NSF USA for their grant numbered NSF-DMS97-04477 and Mirna Džamonja thanks EPSRC for their support through grant number GR/M71121, as well as the Royal Society for their support through grant number SV/ISR/NVB. We would also like to acknowledge the support of the Erdös Research Center in Budapest, during the workshop on set-theoretic topology, July 1999, and the support of Hebrew University of Jerusalem and the Academic Study Group during July 1999.

Keywords: classification theory, unstable theories, SOP hierarchy, oak property.

AMS 2000 Classification: 03C45, 03C55.

in a future paper by S. Shelah and A. Usvyatsov.

The paper is organised as follows. In the first section we investigate the theory T^*_{feq} considered in S. Shelah's [Sh 457]. This is simply the model completion of the theory of infinitely many parametrised equivalence relations. We show that under a partial GCH assumption, this theory is not maximal with respect to $\triangleleft^*_\lambda$, as it is strictly below the theory of a dense linear order. The order $\triangleleft^*_\lambda$ is defined in the first section, and a reference to it was made in the previous paragraph. It was shown in S. Shelah's [Sh 500] that the theory of an infinite dense linear order is $\triangleleft^*_\lambda$-maximal for any $\lambda \geq \aleph_0$. The theory T^*_{feq} is a typical example of a theory with the tree order property (i.e. not simple), but without the strict order property, and it satisfies NSOP_3. In the second section of the paper, we extend Shelah's NSOP_n hierarchy by introducing two further properties, which we call SOP_1 and SOP_2, and we show that their names are justified by their position in the hierarchy. Namely $\mathrm{SOP}_3 \implies \mathrm{SOP}_2 \implies \mathrm{SOP}_1$. Furthermore, SOP_1 theories are not simple. We also show that T^*_{feq} is NSOP_1. The last section of the paper contains the main result, which provides a strong connection (unfortunately not a characterisation) of the $\triangleleft^*$ order with the $(\mathrm{N})\mathrm{SOP}_n$ hierarchy.

The following conventions will be used in the paper.

Convention 0.1 Unless specified otherwise, a "theory" stands for a first order complete theory. An unattributed T stands for a theory. We use $\tau(T)$ to denote the vocabulary of a theory T, and $\mathcal{L}(T)$ to denote the set of formulae of T.

By $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}_T$ we denote a $\bar{\kappa}$-saturated model of T, for a large enough regular cardinal $\bar{\kappa}$ and we assume that any models of T which we mention, are elementary submodels of $\mathfrak{C}$.

λ, μ, κ stand for infinite cardinals.

1 On the order $\triangleleft^*_\lambda$

Definition 1.1 (1) For (first order complete) theories T_0 and T we say that

$$\bar{\varphi} = \langle \varphi_R(\bar{x}_R) : \, R \text{ a predicate of } \tau(T_0) \text{ or a function symbol of } \tau(T_0) \text{ or } =\rangle,$$

(where we have $\bar{x}_R = (x_0, \dots x_{n(R)-1})$), *interprets* T_0 in T, or that $\bar{\varphi}$ *is an interpretation of* T_0 in T, or that

$$T \vdash \text{“}\bar{\varphi} \text{ is a model of } T_0\text{”},$$

if each $\varphi_R(\bar{x}_R) \in \mathcal{L}(T)$, and for any $M \models T$, the model $M^{[\bar{\varphi}]}$ described below is a model of T_0. Here, $N = M^{[\bar{\varphi}]}$ is a $\tau(T)$ model, whose set of elements is $\{a : M \models \varphi_=(a, a)\}$ (so $M^{[\bar{\varphi}]} \subseteq M$) and $R^N = \{\bar{a} : M \models \varphi_R[\bar{a}]\}$ for a predicate R of T_0, and similarly for function symbols of $\tau(T_0)$. To be precise, for a function symbol f of $\tau(T_0)$ we have that $N \models$ “$f(\bar{a}) = b$” iff $M \models \varphi_f(\bar{a}, b)$, while

$$M \models \text{“}\varphi_f(\bar{a}, b) = \varphi_f(\bar{a}, c) \implies b = c\text{”}$$

for all $\bar{a}, b, c$.
(2) We say that the interpretation $\bar{\varphi}$ is *trivial* if $\varphi_R(\bar{x}_R) = R(\bar{x}_R)$ for all $R \in \tau(T_0)$, so $M^{[\bar{\varphi}]} = M \restriction \tau(T_0)$, for any model M of T.

(The last clause in Definition 1.1(1) shows that we can in fact restrict ourselves to vocabularies without function or constant symbols.)

We use the notion of interpretations to define a certain relation among theories. A close variant of this relation was considered by S. Shelah in [Sh 500], section §2.

Note 1.2 The present definition is implied by the one from [Sh 500], and in particular, all results we prove apply also to the order from [Sh 500].

Definition 1.3 For (complete first order) theories T_0, T_1 we define:

(1) A triple $(T, \bar{\varphi}_0, \bar{\varphi}_1)$ is called a (T_0, T_1)-*superior* iff T is a theory and $\bar{\varphi}_l$ is an interpretation of T_l in T, for $l < 2$.

(2) For a cardinal κ, a (T_0, T_1)-superior $(T, \bar{\varphi}_0, \bar{\varphi}_1)$ is called κ-*relevant* iff $|T| < \kappa$.

(3) For regular cardinals λ, μ we say $T_0 \triangleleft^*_{\lambda,\mu} T_1$ if there is a $\min(\mu, \lambda)$-relevant (T_0, T_1)-superior triple $(T, \bar{\varphi}_0, \bar{\varphi}_1)$ such that in every model M of T in which $M^{[\bar{\varphi}_1]}$ is μ-saturated, the model $M^{[\bar{\varphi}_0]}$ is λ-saturated. If this happens, we call the triple a witness for $T_0 \triangleleft^*_{\lambda,\mu} T_1$.

(4) We say that $T_0 \triangleleft^*_{\lambda,\mu} T_1$ *over* θ if $\theta \leq \lambda, \theta \leq \mu$ and $T_0 \triangleleft^*_{\lambda,\mu} T_1$ as witnessed by a $(T, \bar\varphi_0, \bar\varphi_1)$ with $|T| < \theta$.

(5) If $\lambda = \mu$, we write $\triangleleft^*_\lambda$ in place of $\triangleleft^*_{\lambda,\mu}$.

Although in this paper we do not consider the following relations in their own right, it is natural to define:

Definition 1.4 (1) Relations $\triangleleft^{*,1}_{\lambda,\mu}$ and $\triangleleft^{*,1}_\lambda$ are the local versions of $\triangleleft^*_{\lambda,\mu}$ and $\triangleleft^*_\lambda$ respectively, where by a local version we mean that in the definition of the relations, only types of the form

$$p \subseteq \{\pm\vartheta(x, \bar a) : \bar a \in {}^{\lg(\bar y)}M\}$$

for some fixed $\vartheta(x, \bar y)$ are considered.

(2) We say $T_0 \triangleleft^*_{\lambda,\neq} T_1$ iff $T_0 \triangleleft^*_\lambda T_1$ but $\neg(T_1 \triangleleft^*_\lambda T_0)$.

Observation 1.5 (0) If $T_0 \triangleleft^*_{\lambda,\mu} T_1$ and $l < 2$, then there is a witness $(T, \bar\varphi^0, \bar\varphi^1)$ such that $\bar\varphi^l$ is trivial, hence $T_l \subseteq T$.
(1) $\triangleleft^*_\lambda$ is a partial order among theories (note that $T \triangleleft^*_\lambda T$ for every complete T of size $< \lambda$, and that the strict inequality is written as $T_1 \triangleleft^*_{\lambda,\neq} T_2$).
(2) If $T_0 \triangleleft^*_{\lambda,\mu} T_1$ over θ and $T_1 \triangleleft^*_{\mu,\kappa} T_2$ over θ, then $T_0 \triangleleft^*_{\lambda,\kappa} T_2$ over θ.

[Why? (0) Trivial.

(1) Suppose that $T_l \triangleleft^*_\lambda T_{l+1}$ for $l < 2$ over θ, as exemplified by $(T^*, \bar\varphi_0, \bar\varphi_1)$ and $(T^{**}, \bar\psi_1, \bar\psi_2)$ respectively. Without loss of generality, $\bar\varphi_1$ is trivial (apply part (0)), so as T^* is complete we have $T_1 \subseteq T^*$. Similarly, without loss of generality, $\bar\psi_1$ is trivial and so, as T^{**} is complete, we have $T_1 \subseteq T^{**}$. As T_1 is complete, without loss of generality, T^* and T^{**} agree on the common part of their vocabularies, and hence by Robinson Consistency Criterion, $T \overset{\text{def}}{=} T^* \cup T^{**}$ is consistent. Also $|T^*| + |T^{**}| < \theta$, hence $|T| < \theta$. Clearly T interprets T_0, T_1, T_2 by $\bar\varphi_0$, $\bar\varphi_1 = \bar\psi_1$ and $\bar\psi_2$ respectively and T is complete. We now show that the triple $(T, \bar\varphi_0, \bar\psi_2)$ is a (T_0, T_2)-superior which witnesses $T_0 \triangleleft^*_\lambda T_2$ over θ. So suppose that M is a model of T in which $M^{[\bar\psi_2]}$ is λ-saturated. As $(T^{**}, \bar\psi_1, \bar\psi_2)$ witnesses $T_1 \triangleleft^*_\lambda T_2$, we can conclude

that $M^{[\bar{\varphi}_1]} = M^{[\bar{\psi}_1]}$ is λ-saturated. We can argue similarly that $M^{[\bar{\varphi}_0]}$ is λ-saturated.

(2) is proved similarly to (1).]

In this section we consider an example of a theory which is a prototypical example of an NSOP$_3$ theory which is not simple (see [Sh 457]). It is the model completion of the theory of infinitely many (independent) parametrised equivalence relations, formally defined below. We shall prove that for λ such that $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ and $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$, this theory is strictly $\triangleleft^*_{\lambda^+}$-below the theory of a dense linear order with no first or last element.

Definition 1.6 (1) $T_{\rm feq}$ is the following theory in $\{Q, P, E, R, F\}$

(a) Predicates P and Q are unary and disjoint, and $(\forall x)\,[P(x) \vee Q(x)]$,

(b) E is an equivalence relation on Q,

(c) R is a binary relation on $Q \times P$ such that

$$[x\,R\,z \;\&\; y\,R\,z \;\&\; x\,E\,y] \implies x = y.$$

(so R picks for each $z \in Q$ (at most one) representative of any E-equivalence class).

(d) F is a (partial) binary function from $Q \times P$ to Q, which satisfies

$$F(x,z) \in Q \;\& \; (F(x,z))\;R\,z \;\&\; x\,E\;(F(x,z))\,.$$

(so for $x \in Q$ and $z \in P$, the function F picks the representative of the E-equivalence class of x which is in the relation R with z).

(2) $T^+_{\rm feq}$ is $T_{\rm feq}$ with the requirement that F is total.
(3) For $n < \omega$, we let $T^n_{\rm feq}$ be $T^+_{\rm feq}$ enriched by the sentence saying that over any n elements, any (not necessarily complete) quantifier free type consisting of basic (atomic and negations of the atomic) formulae with no direct contradictions, is realised.

Note 1.7 Every model of $T_{\rm feq}$ can be extended to a model of $T^+_{\rm feq}$. $T^+_{\rm feq}$ has the amalgamation property and the joint embedding property. This theory also has a model completion, which can be constructed directly, and which we denote by T^*_{feq}. It follows that T^*_{feq} is a complete theory with infinite models, in which F is a full function.

Remark 1.8 Notice that T_{feq} has been defined somewhat simpler than in [Sh 457, §1], but the difference is non-essential. Up to renaming, the two theories have the same model completion, which is what interests us.

To obtain the theory from [Sh 457], and the origin of the "infinitely many equivalence relations" in the name of the theory, we just need to look at our theory from another point of view. Namely, each E-equivalence class $e = a/E$, gives rise to an equivalence relation E^*_e on P given by:

$$z_1 E_e z_2 \text{ iff } z_1, z_2 \in P \text{ and } F(a, z_1) = F(a, z_2).$$

This definition does not depend on a, just on a/E. Hence we obtain infinitely many independent equivalence relations on P. Conversely, given a model of "infinitely many independent equivalence relations", it is easy to read off a model of T^+_{feq} from it.

Observation 1.9 T^*_{feq} has elimination of quantifiers and for any n, any model of T^*_{feq} is a model of T^n_{feq}.

Notation 1.10 T_{ord} stands for the theory of a dense linear order with no first or last element.

The following convention will make the notation used in this section simpler.

Convention 1.11 Whenever considering $(T_{\mathrm{ord}}, T^*_{\mathrm{feq}})$-superiors $(T, \bar{\varphi}, \bar{\psi})$, we shall make an abuse of notation and assume $\bar{\varphi} = (I, <_0)$ and $\bar{\psi} = (P, Q, E, R)$. In such a case we may also write P^M in place of $P^{M[\bar{\psi}]}$ etc., and we may simply say that T is a $(T_{\mathrm{ord}}, T^*_{\mathrm{feq}})$-superior.

Definition 1.12 For a λ-relevant $(T_{\rm ord}, T^*_{\rm feq})$- superior T, *the statement*

$$*[M, \bar{a}, \bar{b}] = *[M, \bar{a}, \bar{b}, T, \lambda]$$

means:

(i) M is a model of T of size λ,

(ii) $\bar{a} = \langle a_i : i < \lambda \rangle$, $\bar{b} = \langle b_i : i < \lambda \rangle$, are sequences of elements of $I^{M^{[\bar{\varphi}]}}$ such that

$$i < j < \lambda \implies a_i <_0 a_j <_0 b_j <_0 b_i,$$

(iii) there is no $x \in M^{[\bar{\varphi}]}$ such that for all i we have $a_i <_0 x <_0 b_i$,

(iv) the Dedekind cut $\{x : \bigvee_{i<\lambda} x <_0 a_i\}$ is not definable by any formula of $\mathcal{L}(M)$ with parameters in M.

Main Claim 1.13 Assume $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda$ and $(T, \bar{\varphi}, \bar{\psi})$ is a λ-relevant $(T_{\rm ord}, T^*_{\rm feq})$-superior. Further assume that $*[M, \bar{a}, \bar{b}]$ holds, and $p = p(z)$ is a (consistent) $T^*_{\rm feq}$-type over $M^{[\bar{\psi}]}$. Then there is $N \models T$ with $M \prec N$, such that $p(z)$ is realised in $N^{[\bar{\psi}]}$ and $*[N, \bar{a}, \bar{b}]$ holds.

Proof of the Main Claim.

Stage A. Without loss of generality, p is complete in the $T^*_{\rm feq}$-language over $M^{[\bar{\psi}]}$. (By Convention 1.11, we can consider p to be a type over M (rather than $M^{[\bar{\psi}]}$). We shall use this Convention throughout the proof). If p is realised in M, our conclusion follows by taking $N = M$, so let us assume that this is not the case. Using the elimination of quantifiers for $T^*_{\rm feq}$, we can without loss of generality assume that $p(z)$ consists of quantifier free formulas with parameters in M. This means that one of the following three cases must happen:

Case 1. (This will be the main case) $p(z)$ implies that $z \in P$ and it determines which elements of Q^M are R-connected to z. Hence for some function $f : Q^M \to Q^M$ which respects E, i.e.

$$a\,E\,b \implies f(a) = f(b),$$

and

$$f(a) \in a/E^M;$$

we have

$$p(z) = \{P(z)\} \cup \{\, b\,R\,z : \, b \in \mathrm{Rang}(f)\}$$

and no $a \in P^M$ satisfies p.

Case 1A. Like Case 1, but f is a partial function and

$$\begin{aligned} p(z) = \{P(z)\} \cup \{\, f(b)\,R\,z : \, b \in \mathrm{Dom}(f)\} \\ \cup \{\, \neg(b\,R\,z) : \, (b/E^M \cap \mathrm{Rang}(f)) = \emptyset\}. \end{aligned}$$

(This Case will be reduced to Cases 1-3 in Subclaim 1.15).

Case 2. $p(z)$ determines that $z \in Q$ and that it is E-equivalent to some $a^* \in Q^M$, but not equal to any "old" element. Note that in this case if b^* realises $p(z)$, we cannot have $b^* R c$ for any $c \in P^M$, as this would imply $F(a^*, c) = b^* \in M^{[\bar{\psi}]}$ (and we have assumed that p is not realised in $M^{[\bar{\psi}]}$). Hence, the complete M-information is given by

$$p(z) = \{Q(z)\} \cup \{a^*\,E\,z\} \cup \{a \neq z : \, a \in a^*/E^M\}.$$

Case 3. $p(z)$ determines that $z \in Q$, but it has a different E-equivalence class than any of the elements of Q^M. As p is complete, it must determine for which $c \in P^M$ we have $z\,R\,c$, and for which $c, d \in P^M$ we have $F(z,c) = F(z,d)$. Hence, for some $f : P^M \to \{\text{yes, no}\}$ and some $\mathcal{E}$, an equivalence relation on P^M such that $c\mathcal{E}d \implies f(c) = f(d)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} p = \{Q(z)\} \cup \{\neg(a \; E \; z) : \, a \in Q^M\} \cup \{(z \; R \; b)^{f(b)} : \, b \in P^M\} \\ \cup \{(F(z,c) = F(z,d))^{\mathrm{if} c\mathcal{E}d} : \, c, d \in P^M\}. \end{aligned}$$

In the above description, we have used

Notation 1.14 For a formula ϑ we let $\vartheta^{\text{yes}} \equiv \vartheta$ and $\vartheta^{\text{no}} \equiv \neg\vartheta$.

Subclaim 1.15 It suffices to deal with Cases 1,2,3, ignoring the Case 1A.

Proof of the Subclaim. Suppose that we are in the Case 1A. Let

$$\{d_i/E^M : i < i^* \leq \lambda\}$$

list the d/E^M for $d \in Q^M$ such that $d' \in d/E^M \implies \neg(d' \, R \, z) \in p(z)$. We choose by induction on $i \leq i^*$ a pair (M_i, c_i) such that

(a) $M_0 = M$, $||M_i|| = \lambda$,

(b) $\langle M_i : i \leq i^* \rangle$ is an increasing continuous elementary chain,

(c) $*[M_i, \bar{a}, \bar{b}]$

(d) $c_i \in (d_i/E^{M_{i+1}}) \setminus M_i$, for $i < i^*$.

For i limit or $i = 0$, the choice is trivial. For the situation when i is a successor, we use Case 2.

Let $\langle c_i/E^{M_{i^*}} : i \in [i^*, i^{**}) \rangle$ list without repetitions the $c/E^{M_{i^*}}$ which are disjoint to M. Note that $|i^{**}| \leq \lambda$. Let

$$p^+(z) \overset{\text{def}}{=} p(z) \cup \{c_i \, R \, z : i < i^{**}\}.$$

Then $p^+(z)$ is a complete type (for $M_{i^*}^{[\bar{\psi}]}$), and $*[M_{i^*}, \bar{a}, \bar{b}]$ holds by (c). If $p^+(z)$ is realised in M_{i^*}, we can let $N = M_{i^*}$ and we are done. Otherwise, $p^+(z)$ is not realised in M_{i^*} and is a type of the form required in Case 1, so we can proceed to deal with it using the assumptions on Case 1.

$\bigstar_{1.15}$

Stage B. Let us assume that p is a type as in one of the Cases 1,2 or 3, which we can do by Subclaim 1.15. We shall define $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$, an $\prec$-increasing continuous sequence of elementary submodels of M, each of size $< \lambda$, and with union M, such that:

(a) In Case 1, each M_α is closed under f,

(b) In Case 2, $a^* \in M_0$,

(c) For every $\alpha < \lambda$,

$$(M_\alpha, \{(a_j, b_j) : j < \lambda\} \cap M_\alpha) \prec (M, \{(a_j, b_j) : j < \lambda\}),$$

Hence, for some club C of λ consisting of limit ordinals δ, we have that for all $\delta \in C$,

$$a_j \in M_\delta \iff b_j \in M_\delta \iff j < \delta,$$

$$(\forall c \in I^{M_\delta})(\exists j < \delta)\,[c <_0 a_j \vee b_j <_0 c].$$

Let $C = \{\delta_i : i < \lambda\}$ be an increasing continuous enumeration.

Now we come to the **main point** of the proof.

By induction on $i = lg(\eta) < \lambda$ we shall choose $\bar{h} = \langle h_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\lambda>}2\rangle$, a sequence such that

(α) h_η is an elementary embedding of $M_{\delta_{\lg(\eta)}}$ into $\mathfrak{C}_T$, whose range will be denoted by N_η.

(β) $\nu \triangleleft \eta \implies h_\nu \subseteq h_\eta$.

(γ) If $\eta_l \in {}^{\lambda>}2$ for $l = 0, 1$ and $\eta_0 \cap \eta_1 = \eta$, then:

- (i) $N_{\eta_0} \cap N_{\eta_1} = N_\eta$.
- (ii) In addition, if $a_l \in Q^{N_{\eta_l}}$ for $l = 0, 1$ and $a_0 \, E^{\mathfrak{C}_T} a_1$, then for some $a \in Q^{N_\eta}$ we have $a_l E^{\mathfrak{C}_T} a$ for $l = 0, 1$. (Equivalently, if $a_l \in Q^{N_{\eta_l}}$ and $\neg(\exists a \in N_\eta)(\wedge_{l<2} a_l \, E \, a)$, then $\neg(a_0 \, E \, a_1)$).

(δ) If for some $l < 2$ and $\eta \in {}^{\lambda>}2$ we have $a \in N_{\eta\frown\langle l\rangle} \setminus N_\eta$ and $b \in N_\eta$, then $aE^{\mathfrak{C}_T} b$ iff $a = h_{\eta\frown\langle l\rangle}(a')$ for some a' such that $a' E^{\mathfrak{C}_T} h_\eta^{-1}(b)$, for $l < 2$. (In fact, this follows from h_η being onto N_η.)

(ε) $\models$ "$h_{\eta\frown\langle 0\rangle}(b_{\delta_{\lg(\eta)}}) <_0 h_{\eta\frown\langle 1\rangle}(a_{\delta_{\lg(\eta)}})$" (see Convention 1.11 on $<_0$).

We now describe the inductive choice of h_η for $\eta \in {}^{\lambda>}2$, the induction being on $i = lg(\eta)$. Let $h_{\langle\rangle} = \mathrm{id}_{M_0}$. If i is a limit ordinal, we just let $h_\eta \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \bigcup_{j<\lg(\eta)} h_{\eta\restriction j}$. Hence, the point is to handle the successor case.

Fixing $i < \lambda$, let $\langle \eta_{i,\alpha} : \alpha < \alpha^* \leq \lambda\rangle$ list ${}^{i+1}2$, in such a manner that $\eta_{i,2\alpha} \restriction i = \eta_{i,2\alpha+1} \restriction i$ and $\eta_{i,2\alpha+l}(i) = l$ for $l < 2$ (we are using the assumption $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda$). Now we choose $h_{\eta_{i,2\alpha+l}}$ by induction on α. Hence, coming to α, let us denote by η_l the sequence $\eta_{i,2\alpha+l}$, and let $\eta_0 \cap \eta_1 = \eta$ (so $\eta_0 \restriction i = \eta_1 \restriction i = \eta$). Let $M_{\delta_{i+1}} \setminus M_{\delta_i} = \{d^i_j : j < j^*_i\}$, so that $d^i_0 = a_{\delta_i}$ and $d^i_1 = b_{\delta_i}$. We consider the type Γ, which is the union of

(a)

$$\Gamma_0 \overset{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \begin{array}{r} \varphi(x^0_{j_0}, \ldots , x^0_{j_{n-1}}; h_\eta(\bar{c})) : n < \omega \ \& \ \bar{c} \subseteq M_{\delta_i} \ \& \ j_0, \ldots j_{n-1} < j^*_i \ \& \\ M_{\delta_{i+1}} \models \varphi(d^i_{j_0}, \ldots , d^i_{j_{n-1}}; \bar{c}) \end{array} \right\},$$

(taking care of one "side" (for η_0 or η_1) of the part (α) above)

(b) Γ_1, defined analogously to Γ_0, but with $x^0_{j_0}, \ldots , x^0_{j_{n-1}}$ replaced everywhere by $x^1_{j_0}, \ldots , x^1_{j_{n-1}}$,

(taking care of part the remaining "side" (α) above, interchanging η_0 and η_1)

(c) $\Gamma_2 = \{(x^0_0, x^0_1)_I \cap (x^1_0, x^1_1)_I = \emptyset\}$, (this says that the above intervals in $<_0$ are disjoint, which after the right choice of $h_{\eta_0}(d^i_j)$ = a realisation of x^0_j or $h_{\eta_0}(d^i_j)$ = a realisation of x^1_j ($j < 2$), and similarly for h_{η_1}, will take care of the part (ε) above.)

(d) $\Gamma_3 = \Gamma^0_3 \cup \Gamma^1_3$, where

$$\Gamma^l_3 = \left\{ x^l_j \neq c : \ l < 2, j < j^*_i, c \in \cup\{\mathrm{Rang}(h_\rho) : \ h_\rho \text{ already defined}\} \right\}.$$

(e)

$$\Gamma_4 = \{x^0_{j_1} \neq x^1_{j_2} : \ j_0, j_1 < j^*_i\}$$

((d)+ (e) are taking care of (γ) above, part (i)).

(f)

$$\Gamma_5 = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \neg(x^0_{j_0} E x^1_{j_1}) : \text{if } j_0, j_1 < j^*_i \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad \text{but there is no } a \in M_{\delta_i} \text{ with } [d^i_{j_0} E a \ \ \vee \ \ d^i_{j_1} E a] \end{array} \right\}.$$

(together with Γ_6 below, taking care of part (γ)(ii), see below.)

(g) $\Gamma_6 = \Gamma^0_6 \cup \Gamma^1_6$, where

$$\Gamma^l_6 = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \neg(x^l_j E b) : j < j^*_i \text{ and } b \text{ is an element of the set} \\ \qquad\qquad \cup \{\mathrm{Rang}(h_\rho) : \ h_\rho \text{ already defined and } \neg(\exists c \in N_\eta)[b \, E \, c]\} \end{array} \right\}.$$

First note that requiring $\Gamma_5 \cup \Gamma_6$ throughout the construction indeed guarantees that (γ)(ii) is satisfied. Note also that as a part of $\Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \{\neg(x^l_j E h_\eta(b)) :\ b \in M_{\delta_i}\ \&\ \models \neg(d^i_j E b)\ \&\ l < 2\ \&\ j < j^*_i\} \\ \cup\{x^l_j \, E \, h_\eta(b) :\ b \in M_{\delta_i}\ \&\ \models d^i_j E b\ \&\ l < 2\ \&\ j < j^*_i\}, \end{aligned}$$

which takes care of the requirement (δ). We also note that if $j_0, j_1 < j^*_i$ are such that $\neg(x^0_{j_0} \, E \, x^1_{j_1}) \in \Gamma_5$, then $\neg(x^0_{j_1} \, E \, x^1_{j_0}) \in \cap\Gamma_5$.

We conclude that, if Γ is consistent, as $\mathfrak{C}$ is $\bar{\kappa}$-saturated, the functions h_{η_l} can be defined. Namely, for a realisation $\{c^l_j :\ j < j^*_i, l < 2\}$ of Γ, we can define $g_l(d^i_j) = c^l_j$, and then we let $h_{\eta_0} = g_0$ if $c^0_1 <_0 c^1_0$, and g_1 otherwise. We let $h_{\eta_1} = g_{1-l}$ if $h_{\eta_0} = g_l$. This guarantees that (ε) above is satisfied.

Let us then show that Γ is consistent. Suppose for contradiction that this is not so, so we can find a finite $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$ which is inconsistent. Let $\{j_0, \ldots, j_{n-1}\}$ be an increasing enumeration of a set including all $j < j^*_i$ such that x^l_j is mentioned in Γ' for some $l < 2$ and let $\bar{d} = \langle d^i_{j_0}, \ldots d^i_{j_{n-1}} \rangle$. Without loss of generality, 0 and 1 appear in the list $\{j_0, \ldots, j_{n-1}\}$ and $j_0 = 0$ while $j_1 = 1$. By closing under conjunctions and increasing Γ' (retaining that $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$ is finite) if necessary, we may assume that for some formula $\sigma(x_0, \ldots x_{n-1}; \bar{c}) \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{d}/M_{\delta_i})$, we have

$$\Gamma' \cap \Gamma_l = \{\vartheta_l(x^l_{j_0}, \ldots x^l_{j_{n-1}}; h_\eta(\bar{c}))\}$$

for $l < 2$, where $\vartheta_l(x^l_{j_0}, \ldots x^l_{j_{n-1}}; h_\eta(\bar{c}))$ is the formula obtained from σ by replacing x_k by $x^l_{j_k}$ and $\bar{c}$ by $h_\eta(\bar{c})$.

Let ϑ_2 be the formula comprising Γ_2 and $\vartheta^l_3(\bar{x}^l; \bar{c}^l_3) = \bigwedge(\Gamma^l_3 \cap \Gamma')$, while $\vartheta_4 = \bigwedge(\Gamma_4 \cap \Gamma')$ and $\vartheta_5 = \bigwedge(\Gamma_5 \cap \Gamma')$. Let $\vartheta_3 = \vartheta^0_3 \wedge \vartheta^1_3$ and $\vartheta = \bigwedge_{k<6, k\neq 2,3} \vartheta_k$. Without loss of generality, ϑ includes statements $x^l_0 \neq \ldots \neq x^l_{n-1}$ and $x^l_0 <_0 x^l_1$ for $l < 2$. We may also assume that $(x^0_0, x^0_1)_I \cap (x^1_0, x^1_1)_I = \emptyset$ is included in Γ'. The choice of n may be assumed to have been such that for some $c^l_0, \ldots c^l_{n-1}$ (for $l < 2$) from $\bigcup\{\operatorname{Rang}(h_\rho) :\ h_\rho \text{ already defined}\}$, we have

$$\Gamma' \cap \Gamma_3 = \{x^l_{j_m} \neq c^l_k :\ l < 2, k < n, m < n\},$$

and finally that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma' \cap \Gamma_5 = \{\neg(x^0_{j_k} E x^1_{j_m}) : k, m < n\ \& \\ \neg(\exists a \in M_{\delta_i})[d^i_{j_k} E a\ \vee\ d^i_{j_m} E a]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that this implies that for all $j_0, j_1 < j_i^*$ such that $\neg(x^0_{j_0}\, E\, x^1_{j_1}) \in \Gamma' \cap \Gamma_5$ we have $\neg(x^0_{j_0}\, E\, x^1_{j_1}) \in \Gamma' \cap \Gamma_5$. By extending h_η to an automorphism $\hat{h}_\eta$ of $\mathfrak{C}$, and applying $(\hat{h}_\eta)^{-1}$, we may assume that $h_\eta = \mathrm{id}_{M_{\delta_i}}$. We can also assume that no c^l_k is an element of M_{δ_i}, as otherwise the relevant inequalities can be absorbed by σ.

We shall use the following general

Fact 1.16 Suppose that $N \prec \mathfrak{C}$ and $\bar{e} \in {}^m\mathfrak{C}$ is disjoint from N, while $N \subseteq A$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} r(\bar{x}) \overset{\text{def}}{=} &\mathrm{tp}(\bar{e}, N) \cup \{x_k \neq d : d \in A \setminus N, k < m\} \\ &\cup \{\neg(x_k E d) : d \in A \ \&\ (d/E) \cap N = \emptyset, k < m\}, \end{aligned}$$

is consistent (and in fact, every finite subset of it is realised in N).

Proof of the Fact. Otherwise, there is a finite $r'(\bar{x}) \subseteq r(\bar{x})$ which is inconsistent. Without loss of generality, $r'(\bar{x})$ is the union of sets of the following form (we have a representative type of the sets for each clause)

- $\{\varrho(\bar{x}, \bar{c})\}$ for some $\bar{c} \subseteq N$ and ϱ such that $\models \varrho[\bar{e}, \bar{c}]$.
- $\{x_k \neq \hat{c}^s_k : k < m\}$ for some $\hat{c}^s_0, \dots \hat{c}^s_{m-1} \in A \setminus N$ and $s < s^* < \omega$,
- $\{\neg(x_k\, E\, \hat{d}^t_k) : k < m\}$ for some $\hat{d}^t_0, \dots \hat{d}^t_{m-1} \in A \setminus N$ and $t < t^* < \omega$ such that $(\hat{d}^t_k/E) \cap N = \emptyset$.

By the elementarity of N, there is $\bar{e}' \in N$ with $N \models \varrho[\bar{e}', \bar{c}]$. By the choice of the rest of the formulas in $\bar{r}'(\bar{x})$, we see that $\bar{e}'$ satisfies them as well, which is a contradiction. $\bigstar_{1.16}$

Let $\bar{x}^l = (x^l_0, \dots, x^l_{n-1})$ for $l < 2$. Let

$$\Phi_0 \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{\varphi(\bar{x}^0) : \varphi(x^0_{j_0}, \dots, x^0_{j_{n-1}}) \in \Gamma' \cap (\Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma^0_3 \cup \Gamma^0_6)\}.$$

Applying the last phrase in the above Fact to $\Phi_0(\bar{x}^0)$, the model M_{δ_i} and $\bar{d}$, we obtain a sequence $\bar{e}^0 = (e^0_0, \dots e^0_{n-1}) \in M_{\delta_i}$ which realises $\Phi_0(\bar{x}^0)$. For k, m such that $\neg(x^0_{j_k} E x^1_{j_m}) \in \Gamma_5$ we have $\neg(\exists a \in M_{\delta_i})(aEd^i_{j_k} \vee aEd^i_{j_m})$. So

$$\neg(x_k E e^0_m) \wedge \neg(e^0_m\, E\, x_m) \in \mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}/M_{\delta_i}).$$

Let now

$$\Phi_1(\bar{x}^1) = \{\neg(x^1_k \, E \, e^0_m) \wedge \neg(e^0_k \, E \, x^1_m) : \neg(x^0_{j_k} \, E \, x^1_{j_m}) \in \Gamma_5\}$$
$$\cup\{x^1_k \neq e^0_m : k, m < n\} \cup \{\varphi(\bar{x}^1) : \varphi(x^1)j_0, \dots, x^1_{j_{n-1}}) \in \Gamma' \cap (\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma^1_3 \cup \Gamma^1_6)\}.$$

$\Phi_1(\bar{x}^1)$ is a finite set to which we can apply the last phrase of Fact 1.16. In this way we find $\bar{e}^1 = (e^1_0, \dots e^1_{n-1}) \in M_{\delta_i}$ realising $\Phi_1(\bar{x}^1)$. Now we show that $\bar{e}^0 \frown \bar{e}^1$ realises $\Gamma' \setminus \Gamma_2$. So suppose $\neg(x^0_{j_k} E x^1_{j_m}) \in \Gamma' \cap \Gamma_5$, then $\neg(x^1_k \, E \, e^0_m) \in \Phi_1$, hence $\neg(e^1_k E e^0_m)$. Also $\wedge_{k,m<n}(e^1_k \neq e^0_m)$ holds, by the choice of Φ_1, so $\bar{e}^0 \frown \bar{e}^1$ realises $\Gamma' \cap \Gamma_4$. Now we need to deal with Γ_2. Let

$$\mathcal{D} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{(\bar{u}^0, \bar{u}^1) : (\bar{u}^0, \bar{u}^1) \text{ satisfies } \vartheta\}.$$

So $\mathcal{D}$ is first order definable with parameters in M_{δ_i} and we have just shown that $\mathcal{D} \cap M_{\delta_i} \neq \emptyset$. Also if $\bar{e}^0 \frown \bar{e}^1 \subseteq M_{\delta_i}$ satisfies ϑ, it necessarily realises $\Gamma' \setminus \Gamma_2$ (as no $c^l_k \in M_{\delta_i}$, see the definition). As Γ' is presumed to be inconsistent, no $(\bar{u}^0, \bar{u}^1) \in \mathcal{D} \cap M_{\delta_i}$ can realise Γ', i.e. satisfy ϑ_2, and hence for no $(\bar{u}^0, \bar{u}^1) \in \mathcal{D} \cap M_{\delta_i}$ are the intervals $(u^0_0, u^0_1)_I$ and $(u^1_0, u^1_1)_I$ disjoint. Now we claim that if $(\bar{u}^0, \bar{u}^1) \in M_{\delta_i} \cap \mathcal{D}$, then $(u^0_0, u^0_1)_I \cap (a_{\delta_i}, b_{\delta_i})_I \neq \emptyset$.

Indeed, suppose otherwise, say $u^0_1 <_0 d^i_0 = a_{\delta_i}$. Hence $u^0_1 <_0 x_0 \in \text{tp}(\bar{d}/M_{\delta_i})$. Arguing as above, with $\bar{u}^0$ in place of $\bar{e}^0$ and $\Phi_1(\bar{x}) \cup \{u^0_1 <_0 x^1_0\}$ in place of $\Phi_1(\bar{x}^1)$, we can find $\bar{u} \in M_{\delta_i}$ satisfying $(u^0_1 <_0 u_0)$ and such that $(\bar{u}^0, \bar{u})$ satisfies ϑ. So $(\bar{u}^0, \bar{u}) \in \mathcal{D} \cap M_{\delta_i}$ and the intervals $(u^0_0, u^0_1)_I$ and $(u_0, u_1)_I$ are disjoint, a contradiction. A similar contradiction can be derived from the assumption $b_{\delta_i} = d^{\delta_i}_1 <_0 u^0_0$. Now note that $(\bar{u}^0, \bar{u}^1) \in \mathcal{D} \implies (\bar{u}^1, \bar{u}^0) \in \mathcal{D}$, so if $(\bar{u}^0, \bar{u}^1) \in \mathcal{D} \cap M_{\delta_i}$ we also have $(u^1_0, u^1_1)_I \cap (a_{\delta_i}, b_{\delta_i})_I \neq \emptyset$.

By the choice of C, there is no $x \in M_{\delta_i}$ with $d^{\delta_i}_0 \leq_0 x \leq_0 d^{\delta_i}_1$, hence

$$\text{if } (\bar{u}^0, \bar{u}^1) \in M_{\delta_i} \cap \mathcal{D} \text{ and } l < 2, \text{ we have } u^l_0 <_0 d^{\delta_i}_0 <_0 d^{\delta_i}_1 <_0 u^l_1. \qquad (*)$$

Let $\sigma^*(\bar{y})$ be $\exists \bar{x}((\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{D})$. Hence if

$$\varrho_0(z) = (\exists \bar{y})[\sigma^*(\bar{y}) \wedge z \leq_0 y_0]$$

and

$$\varrho_1(z) = (\exists \bar{y})[\sigma^*(\bar{y}) \wedge y_1 \leq_0 z],$$

then

$$M_{\delta_i} \models (\forall z_0, z_1)[\varrho_0(z_0) \wedge \varrho_1(z_1) \implies z_0 <_0 z_1].$$

Of course, this holds in $\mathfrak{C}$ as well, so

(a) $\varrho_0(z)$ defines an initial segment of I,

(b) $\varrho_1(z)$ defines an end segment of I,

(c) the segments defined by $\varrho_0(z)$ and $\varrho_1(z)$ are disjoint,

(d) $\varrho_0(M_{\delta_i}) \cup \varrho_1(M_{\delta_i}) = I \cap M_{\delta_i}$.

[Why? Note that $(\bar{e}^0, \bar{d}) \in \mathcal{D}$. Hence $\sigma^*(\bar{d})$ holds. As for every $a \in I \cap M_{\delta_i}$ we have $a <_I a_{\delta_i}$ or $a >_I b_{\delta_i}$, the conclusions follows.]

(e) $\varrho_0(a_{\delta_i})$ and $\varrho_1(b_{\delta_i})$ hold.

[Why? Again because $\sigma^*(\bar{d})$ holds.]

The above arguments show that $\{x : (\exists \bar{y})[(\sigma^*(\bar{y}) \wedge x <_0 y_0)]\}$ defines the Dedekind cut $\{x : x <_0 a_{\delta_i}\}$ over M_{δ_i}, which contradicts the choice of C and the fact that the Dedekind cut induced by $(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ is not definable (which is a part of the definition of $*[M, \bar{a}, \bar{b}]$).

Stage C. Now we have shown that the trees $\langle N_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\lambda >}2\rangle$, $\langle h_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\lambda >}2\rangle$ of models and embeddings can be defined as required, and we consider

$$p^* \overset{\text{def}}{=} \cup_{\eta \in {}^{\lambda>}2} h_\eta(p \restriction M_{\delta_{lg(\eta)}}).$$

We shall show that p^* is finitely satisfiable, hence satisfiable. Let $\Gamma' \subseteq p^*$ be finite. Recalling the analysis of p from Stage A, we consider each of the cases by which p could have been defined (ignoring Case 1A, as justified by Subclaim 1.15.)

Case 1. In this case there is a function $f : Q^M \to Q^M$ respecting E, with $aEf(a)$ for all $a \in Q^M$, and without loss of generality there are some $\eta_0, \ldots \eta_{m-1} \in {}^{\lambda >}2$ and $\{b^j_i : j < m, i < n_j\} \subseteq \mathrm{Rang}(f)$ such that

$$\Gamma' = \{P(z)\} \cup \bigcup_{j<m} \{h_{\eta_j}(b^j_i) R\, z : i < n_j\},$$

and for each j we have $\{b^j_i : i < n_j\} \subseteq M_{\delta_{\lg(\eta_j)}}$. Let $n \overset{\text{def}}{=} \Sigma_{j<m} n_j$, hence Γ' is a quantifier free (partial) type over n variables in $\mathfrak{C}^{[\bar{\psi}]}$. By Observation 1.9 , we only need to check that in Γ' there are no direct contradictions with the axioms of $T^+_{\rm feq}$.

The only possibility for such a contradiction is that for some j_0, j_1 and $b^{j_0}_i$, $b^{j_1}_k$ we have

$$h_{\eta_{j_0}}(b^{j_0}_i) \neq h_{\eta_{j_1}}(b^{j_1}_k) \wedge h_{\eta_{j_0}}(b^{j_0}_i) E\, h_{\eta_{j_1}}(b^{j_1}_k)$$

and $h_{j_0}(b^{j_0}_i) R\, z, h_{j_1}(b^{j_1}_k) R\, z \in \Gamma'$. In such a case, any c which would realise Γ' would contradict part (c) of the definition of $T^+_{\rm feq}$. Suppose that $b^{j_0}_i, b^{j_1}_k$ and η_0, η_1 are as above. Let $\eta_l \overset{\text{def}}{=} \eta_{j_l}$ for $l < 2$ and let $\eta = \eta_0 \cap \eta_1$. By part (γ)(ii) in the definition of $\bar{h}$, there is $\hat{b} \in N_\eta$ such that $h_{\eta_0}(b^{j_0}_i) E\, \hat{b}$ and $h_{\eta_1}(b^{j_1}_k) E\, \hat{b}$. For some $b \in M_{\delta_{\lg(\eta)}}$ we have

$$h_{\eta_0}(b) = h_{\eta_1}(b) = h_\eta(b) = \hat{b},$$

so applying the elementarity of the maps, we obtain

$$b^{j_0}_i E\, b E\, b^{j_1}_k.$$

On the other hand, by the definition of p^* we have $b^{j_0}_i R\, z \in p(z)$ and $b^{j_1}_k R\, z \in p(z)$. By the the demands on p this implies that $b^{j_0}_i = b^{j_1}_k \notin M_{\delta_{\lg(\eta)}}$ and $f(b) = b^{j_0}_i$, contradicting the fact that $M_{\delta_{\lg(\eta)}}$ is closed under f.

Case 2. For a fixed $a^* \in M_0$ we have

$$p(z) = \{Q(z)\} \cup \{a^* E z\} \cup \{z \neq c : c \in a^*/E^M\},$$

so without loss of generality

$$p^*(z) = \{Q(z)\} \cup \{a^*\, E\, z\} \cup \{z \neq h_{\eta_j}(c_j) : j < m\}$$

for some $c_0, \ldots, c_{m-1} \in a^*/E^M$ and $\eta_0, \ldots, \eta_{m-1} \in {}^{\lambda>}2$, as $h_{\langle\rangle} = {\rm id}_{M_0}$. As a^*/E is infinite in any model of $T^*_{\rm feq}$, the set Γ' is consistent.

Case 3. We may assume that for some equivalence relation $\mathcal{E}$ on P^M, a function f from P^M into $\{\text{yes}, \text{no}\}$, sequences $\eta_0, \ldots \eta_{n-1} \in {}^{\lambda>}2$, and

$\{a_i^k : i < m, k < n\} \subseteq Q^M$ and $\{b_i^k, c_i^k, d_i^k : i < m, k < n\} \subseteq P^M$ we have $e_1 \,\mathcal{E}\, e_2 \implies f(e_1) = f(e_2)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma'(z) = &\{Q(z)\} \cup \bigcup_{k<n} \{\neg(h_{\eta_k}(a_i^k) E z) : i < m\} \cup \bigcup_{k<n} \{(z R\, h_{\eta_k}(b_i^k))^{f(b_i^k)} : i < m\} \\ &\cup \bigcup_{k<n} \{[F(z, h_{\eta_k}(c_i^k)) = F(z, h_{\eta_k}(d_i^k))]^{\text{if} c_i^k \mathcal{E} d_i^k} : i < m\}.\end{aligned}$$

We could have a contradiction if for some k_1, k_2, i_1, i_2 we had $f(b_{i_1}^{k_1})$ =yes, $f(b_{i_2}^{k_2})$ =no, but $h_{\eta_{k_1}}(b_{i_1}^{k_1}) = h_{\eta_{k_2}}(b_{i_2}^{k_2})$, which cannot happen by γ(i) and the fact that each h_η is 1-1. Another possibility is that for some $b_{i_1}^{k_1}, b_{i_2}^{k_2}$ we have $f(b_{i_1}^{k_1}) = f(b_{i_2}^{k_2})$=yes, but $h_{\eta_{k_1}}(b_{i_1}^{k_1}) \neq h_{\eta_{k_2}}(b_{i_2}^{k_2})$ while $h_{\eta_{k_1}}(b_{i_1}^{k_1}) \,E\, h_{\eta_{k_2}}(b_{i_2}^{k_2})$. To see that this cannot happen, we distinguish various possibilities for $b_{i_1}^{k_1}, b_{i_2}^{k_2}$ and use part (γ)(ii) in the choice of $\bar{h}$.

Yet another possible source of contradiction could come from a similar consideration involving the last clause in the definition of $\Gamma'(z)$, which cannot happen for similar reasons.

Stage D. Now we can conclude, using $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ and $|T| < \lambda$, that there is a model $N^* \prec \mathfrak{C}$ of size λ with $\bigcup_{\eta \in {}^{\lambda >}2} N_\eta \subseteq N^*$, such that p^* is realised in N^*. For $\nu \in {}^\lambda 2$, let $h_\nu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \cup_{i<\lambda} h_{\nu \restriction i}$, and let $N_\nu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Rang}(h_\nu)$, while $p_\nu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h_\nu(p)$.

For such ν, let

$$q_\nu(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{I(x)\} \cup \{h_\nu(a_i) <_0 x <_0 h_\nu(b_i) : i < \lambda\}.$$

Hence we have that for $\nu \neq \rho$ from ${}^\lambda 2$, the types q_ν and q_ρ are contradictory, by (ε) above. As $||N^*|| + |L(T)| \leq \lambda$, there are only $\leq \lambda$ definable Dedekind cuts of $<_0$ over N^*, and only $\leq \lambda$ types q_ν are realised in N^*. Hence there is $\nu \in {}^\lambda 2$ (actually 2^λ many) such that the Dedekind cut $\{x : \vee_{i<\lambda} x <_0 h_\nu(a_i)\}$ is not definable over N^* and q_ν is not realised in N^*. So N^* omits q_ν and realises p_ν. We let $N = h(N^*)$, where h is an automorphism of $\mathfrak{C}$ extending h_ν^{-1}. $\bigstar_{1.13}$

Theorem 1.17 Assume that $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda$ and $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$.
(1) For any λ-relevant $(T_{\text{ord}}, T^*_{\text{feq}})$ -superior $(T, \bar{\varphi}, \bar{\psi})$, the theory T has a model M^* of cardinality λ^+ such that

(i) $\bar{\varphi}^{M^*}$ is not λ^+-saturated,

(ii) $\bar{\psi}^{M^*}$ is λ^+-saturated.

(2) We can strengthen the claims in (i) and (ii) to include any interpretations of a dense linear order and T^*_{feq}-respectively in M^*, even with parameters.

Proof. We prove (1), and (2) is proved similarly. Using the Main Claim 1.13, we can construct M^* of size λ^+, by an $\prec$-increasing continuous sequence $\langle M^*_i : i \leq \lambda^+ \rangle$, with $||M^*_i|| = \lambda$ satisfying $*[M_i, \bar{a}, \bar{b}]$ for each $i \leq \lambda^+$, and letting $M^* = M_{\lambda^+}$. The Main Claim 1.13 is used in the successor steps. To assure that M^* is λ^+-saturated for T^*_{feq}, we use the assumption $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$, to do the bookkeeping of all T^*_{feq}-types involved. $\bigstar_{1.17}$

Conclusion 1.18 Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.17, the theory T^*_{feq} is $\triangleleft^*_{\lambda^+}$ strictly below the theory of a dense linear order with no first or last elements.

[Why? It is below by [Sh 500], §2, see Note 1.2.]

2 On the properties SOP_2 and SOP_1

In his paper [Sh 500], S. Shelah investigated a hierarchy of properties unstable theories without strong order property may have. This hierarchy is named NSOP_n for $3 \leq n < \omega$, where the acronym NSOP stands for "not strong order property". The negation of NSOP_n is denoted by SOP_n. It was shown in [Sh 500] that $\mathrm{SOP}_{n+1} \implies \mathrm{SOP}_n$, that the implication is strict and that SOP_3 theories are not simple. In this section we investigate two further notions, which with the intention of furthering the above hierarchy, we name SOP_2 and SOP_1. In section 3, a connection between this hierarchy and $\triangleleft^*_\lambda$-maximality will be established.

Recall from [Sh 500] one of the equivalent definitions of SOP_3. (The equivalence is established in Claim 2.19 of [Sh 500]).

Definition 2.1 A complete theory T has SOP_3 iff there is an indiscernible sequence $\langle \bar{a}_i : i < \omega \rangle$ and formulae $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$, $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ such that

(a) $\{\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y}),\psi(\bar{x},\bar{y})\}$ is contradictory,

(b) for some sequence $\langle \bar{b}_j : j<\omega\rangle$ we have

$$i\le j \implies \models \varphi[\bar{b}_j,\bar{a}_i] \text{ and } i>j \implies \models \psi[\bar{b}_j,\bar{a}_i].$$

(c) for $i<j$, the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{a}_j),\psi(\bar{x},\bar{a}_i)\}$ is contradictory.

Definition 2.2 (1) T has SOP_2 if there is a formula $\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y})$ which exemplifies this property in $\mathfrak{C}=\mathfrak{C}_T$, which means:

There are $\bar{a}_\eta \in \mathfrak{C}$ for $\eta \in {}^{\omega>}2$ such that

(a) For every $\eta \in {}^{\omega}2$, the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{a}_{\eta\restriction n}) : n<\omega\}$ is consistent.

(b) If $\eta,\nu \in {}^{\omega>}2$ are incomparable, $\{\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{a}_\eta),\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{a}_\nu)\}$ is inconsistent.

(2) T has SOP_1 if there is a formula $\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y})$ which exemplifies this in $\mathfrak{C}$, which means:

There are $\bar{a}_\eta \in \mathfrak{C}$, for $\eta \in {}^{\omega>}2$ such that:

(a) for $\rho \in {}^{\omega}2$ the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{a}_{\rho\restriction n}) : n<\omega\}$ is consistent.

(b) if $\nu \frown \langle 0\rangle \trianglelefteq \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2$, then $\{\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{a}_\eta),\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{a}_{\nu\frown\langle 1\rangle})\}$ is inconsistent.

(3) NSOP_2 and NSOP_1 are the negations of SOP_2 and SOP_1 respectively.

The definition of when a theory has SOP_1 can be made in another, equivalent, fashion.

Definition 2.3 Let $\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y})$ be a formula of $\mathcal{L}(T)$. We say $\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y})$ has SOP_1' iff there are $\langle \bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2\rangle$ in $\mathfrak{C}_T$ such that

(a) $\{\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{a}_{\eta\restriction n})^{\eta(n)} : n<\omega\}$ is consistent for every $\eta \in {}^{\omega}2$, where we use the notation

$$\varphi^l = \begin{cases} \varphi & \text{if } l=1, \\ \neg\varphi & \text{if } l=0 \end{cases}$$

for $l<2$.

(b) If $\nu \frown \langle 0\rangle \trianglelefteq \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2$, then $\{\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{a}_\eta),\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{a}_\nu)\}$ is inconsistent.

We say that T has property SOP_1' iff some formula of $\mathcal{L}(T)$ has it.

Claim 2.4 (1) If $\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y})$ exemplifies SOP_1 of T then $\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y})$ (hence T) has property SOP_1'.

(2) If T has property SOP_1' then T has SOP_1.

Proof of the Claim. (1) Let $\{\bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2\}$ and $\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y})$ exemplify that T has SOP_1. For $\eta \in {}^{\omega>}2$ we define $\bar{b}_\eta \overset{\text{def}}{=} \bar{a}_{\eta\frown\langle 1\rangle}$. We shall show that $\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y})$ and $\{\bar{b}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2\}$ exemplify SOP_1'.

Given $\hat{\eta} \in {}^{\omega}2$. Let $\bar{c}$ exemplify that item (a) from Definition 2.2(2) holds for $\hat{\eta}$. Given $n < \omega$, we consider $\varphi[\bar{c},\bar{b}_{\hat{\eta}\restriction n}]^{\hat{\eta}(n)}$. If $\hat{\eta}(n) = 1$, then, as $\bar{b}_{\hat{\eta}\restriction n} = \bar{a}_{\hat{\eta}\restriction n\frown\langle 1\rangle} = \bar{a}_{\hat{\eta}\restriction(n+1)}$, we have that $\varphi[\bar{c},\bar{b}_{\hat{\eta}\restriction n}]^{\hat{\eta}(n)} = \varphi[\bar{c},\bar{a}_{\hat{\eta}\restriction(n+1)}]$ holds. If $\hat{\eta}(n) = 0$, then

$$(\hat{\eta}\restriction n) \frown \langle 0\rangle = \hat{\eta}\restriction(n+1).$$

As $\varphi[\bar{c},\bar{a}_{\hat{\eta}\restriction(n+1)}]$ holds, by (b) of Definition 2.2(2), we have that $\varphi[\bar{c},\bar{a}_{\hat{\eta}\restriction n\frown\langle 1\rangle}]$ cannot hold, showing again that, $\varphi[\bar{c},\bar{b}_{\hat{\eta}\restriction n}]^{\hat{\eta}(n)} = \neg\varphi[\bar{c},\bar{a}_{\hat{\eta}\restriction n\frown\langle 1\rangle}]$ holds. This shows that $\{\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{b}_{\hat{\eta}\restriction n})^{\hat{\eta}(n)} : n < \omega\}$ is consistent, as exemplified by $\bar{c}$.

Suppose $\nu \frown \langle 0\rangle \trianglelefteq \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2$ and that $\varphi[\bar{d},\bar{b}_\eta] \wedge \varphi[\bar{d},\bar{b}_\nu]$ holds. So both $\varphi[\bar{d},\bar{a}_{\eta\frown\langle 1\rangle}]$ and $\varphi[\bar{d},\bar{a}_{\nu\frown\langle 1\rangle}]$ hold. On the other hand, as $\nu \frown \langle 0\rangle \trianglelefteq \eta$, clearly $\nu \frown \langle 0\rangle \trianglelefteq \eta \frown \langle 1\rangle$, and so (b) of Definition 2.2(2) implies that $\{\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{a}_{\eta\frown\langle 1\rangle}),\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{a}_{\nu\frown\langle 1\rangle})\}$ is contradictory, a contradiction. Hence the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{b}_\eta),\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{b}_\nu)\}$ is contradictory

(2) Define first for $\eta \in {}^{\omega\geq}2$ an element $\rho_\eta \in {}^{\omega\geq}2$ by letting

$$\rho_\eta(3k) = \eta(k),$$

$$\rho_\eta(3k+1) = 0,$$

$$\rho_\eta(3k+2) = 1,$$

and if $lg(\eta) = k < \omega$, then $lg(\rho_\eta) = 3k$. Notice that for $\eta \in {}^{\omega}2$ and $k < \omega$ we have $\rho_{\eta\restriction k} = \rho_\eta \restriction (3k)$.

Let $\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y})$ and $\{\bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2\}$ exemplify property SOP'_1. We pick $c_0 \neq c_1$ and define for $\eta \in {}^{\omega>}2$

$$\bar{b}_{\eta\frown\langle 1\rangle} \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \bar{a}_{\rho_\eta} \frown \bar{a}_{\rho_\eta\frown\langle 1\rangle} \frown \langle c_0, c_1\rangle,$$

$$\bar{b}_{\eta\frown\langle 0\rangle} \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \bar{a}_{\rho_\eta\frown\langle 0,0\rangle} \frown \bar{a}_{\rho_\eta} \frown \langle c_0, c_1\rangle,$$

$$\bar{b}_{\langle\rangle} \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \langle c_0\rangle_{2n+2},$$

where $\langle c\rangle_k$ stands for the sequence of k entries, each of which is c, and $n = lg(\bar{y})$ in $\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y})$. We define

$$\psi(\bar{x},\bar{z}) \equiv \psi(\bar{x},\bar{z}^0 \frown \bar{z}^1 \frown w^0 \frown w^1) \equiv \\ [w^0 = w^1] \vee [\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{z}^0) \wedge \neg\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{z}^1)],$$

where $\bar{z} = \bar{z}^0 \frown \bar{z}^1 \frown \langle w^0, w^1\rangle$ and $lg(\bar{z}^0) = lg(\bar{z}^1) = lg(\bar{y})$. We now claim that $\psi(\bar{x},\bar{z})$ and $\{\bar{b}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2\}$ exemplify that SOP_1 holds for T. Before we start checking this, note that for $\eta \in {}^{\omega>}2$ we have:

$\bullet_1$ $\psi(\bar{x},\bar{b}_{\langle\rangle})$ holds for any $\bar{x}$,

$\bullet_2$ $\psi(\bar{x},\bar{b}_{\eta\frown\langle 0\rangle})$ holds iff $\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{a}_{\rho_\eta\frown\langle 0,0\rangle}) \wedge \neg\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{a}_{\rho_\eta})$ holds,

$\bullet_3$ $\psi(\bar{x},\bar{b}_{\eta\frown\langle 1\rangle})$ holds iff $\neg\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{a}_{\rho_\eta\frown\langle 1\rangle}) \wedge \varphi(\bar{x},\bar{a}_{\rho_\eta})$ holds.

Let us verify 2.2(2)(a), so let $\eta \in {}^{\omega}2$. Pick $\bar{c}$ such that $\varphi[\bar{c},\bar{a}_{\rho_\eta\restriction n}]^{\rho_\eta(n)}$ holds for all $n < \omega$. We claim that

$$\psi[\bar{c},\bar{b}_{\eta\restriction n}] \text{ holds for all } n. \tag{$*$}$$

The proof is by induction on n.

If $\underline{n = 0}$, this is trivially true. If $\underline{n = k+1}$ and $\underline{\eta(k) = 0}$, then we need to verify that $\varphi[\bar{c},\bar{a}_{\rho_{\eta\restriction k}\frown\langle 0,0\rangle}]$ holds and $\neg\varphi[\bar{c},\bar{a}_{\rho_{\eta\restriction k}}]$ holds. We have

$$\rho_{\eta\restriction k} \frown \langle 0,0\rangle = \rho_\eta \restriction (3k+2),$$

and $\rho_\eta(3k+2) = 1$. Hence $\varphi[\bar{c}, \bar{a}_{\rho_{\eta\restriction k}\frown\langle 0,0\rangle}]$ holds by the choice of $\bar{c}$. On the other hand, we have $\rho_{\eta\restriction k} = \rho_\eta \restriction (3k)$, and $\rho_\eta(3k) = \eta(k) = 0$, hence $\neg\varphi[\bar{c}, \bar{a}_{\rho_{\eta\restriction k}}]$ holds.

If $\underline{n = k+1}$ and $\underline{\eta(k) = 1}$, then we need to verify that $\varphi[\bar{c}, \bar{a}_{\rho_{\eta\restriction k}}]$ holds while $\varphi[\bar{c}, \bar{a}_{\rho_\eta\restriction(3k)\frown\langle 1\rangle}]$ does not. As $\rho_{\eta\restriction k} = \rho_\eta \restriction (3k)$, and $\rho_\eta(3k) = \eta(k) = 1$, we have that $\varphi[\bar{c}, \bar{a}_{\rho_\eta\restriction k})]$ holds. Note that $\varphi[\bar{c}, \bar{a}_{\rho_\eta\restriction(3k+2)}]$ holds as $\rho_\eta(3k+2) = 1$. We also have $(\rho_\eta \restriction (3k+1)) \frown \langle 0\rangle \trianglelefteq \rho_\eta \restriction (3k+2)$. Hence $\neg\varphi[\bar{c}, \bar{a}_{\rho_\eta\restriction(3k+1)}]$ by part (b) in Definition 2.3. But

$$\neg\varphi[\bar{c}, \bar{a}_{\rho_\eta\restriction(3k+1)}] \equiv \neg\varphi[\bar{c}, \bar{a}_{\rho_\eta\restriction(3k)\frown\langle 1\rangle}] \equiv \neg\varphi[\bar{c}, \bar{a}_{\rho_{\eta\restriction k}\frown\langle 1\rangle}]$$

holds, so we are done proving $(*)$.

Let us now verify 2.2(2)(b). So suppose $\nu \frown \langle 0\rangle \trianglelefteq \eta$ and consider $\{\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{\nu\frown\langle 1\rangle}), \psi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_\eta)\}$. Let $\eta = \sigma \frown \langle l\rangle$.

Case 1. $\nu = \sigma$.

Hence $l = 0$. So $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_\eta) \implies \neg\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\rho_\nu})$ and $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{\nu\frown\langle 1\rangle}) \implies \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\rho_\nu})$, by $\bullet_2$ and $\bullet_3$ respectively, showing that $\{\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_\eta), \psi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{\nu\frown\langle 1\rangle})\}$ is inconsistent.

Case 2. $\nu \triangleleft \sigma$ and $l = 0$.

Hence $\nu \frown \langle 0\rangle \trianglelefteq \sigma$. Clearly $\rho_\nu \frown \langle 0\rangle \trianglelefteq \rho_\sigma \frown \langle 0, 0\rangle$, as

$$\rho_\sigma(lg(\rho_\nu)) = \sigma(lg(\nu)) = 0.$$

We have $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{\nu\frown\langle 1\rangle}) \implies \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\rho_\nu})$ by $\bullet_3$ and $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_\eta) \implies \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\rho_\sigma\frown\langle 0,0\rangle})$ $\bullet_2$, and the two formulae being implied are contradictory, by (b) in the definition of SOP_1'.

Case 3. $\nu \triangleleft \sigma$ and $l = 1$.

Observe that $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_\eta) \implies \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\rho_\sigma})$ by $\bullet_3$ and $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{\nu\frown\langle 1\rangle}) \implies \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\rho_\nu})$. As above, using $\nu \frown \langle 0\rangle \trianglelefteq \sigma$, we show that the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\rho_\nu}), \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\rho_\sigma})\}$ is inconsistent. $\bigstar_{2.4}$

Conclusion 2.5 T has SOP_1 iff T has property SOP_1' from Claim 2.4.

Question 2.6 Is the conclusion of 2.5 true when the theory T is replaced by a formula φ?

The following Claim establishes the relative position of the properties introduced in Definition 2.2 within the (N)SOP hierarchy.

Claim 2.7 For any complete first order theory T, we have

$$\mathrm{SOP}_3 \implies \mathrm{SOP}_2 \implies \mathrm{SOP}_1.$$

Proof of the Claim. Suppose that T is SOP_3, as exemplified by $\langle \bar{a}_i : i < \omega \rangle$, $\langle \bar{b}_j : j < \omega \rangle$ and formulae $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ and $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ (see Definition 2.1), and we shall show that T satisfies SOP_2. We define

$$\vartheta(\bar{x}, \bar{y}^0 \frown \bar{y}^1) \equiv \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}^0) \wedge \psi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}^1), \text{ where } lg(\bar{y}^0) = lg(\bar{y}^1.$$

Let us first prove the consistency of

$$\Gamma \overset{\text{def}}{=} \begin{array}{l} T \cup \{\neg(\exists \bar{x})[\vartheta(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_\eta) \wedge \vartheta(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_\nu)] : \eta \perp \nu \text{ in } {}^{\omega >}2\} \cup \\ \cup \bigcup_{n<\omega} \{(\exists \bar{x})[\bigwedge_{k \leq n} \vartheta(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_{\eta \restriction k})] : \eta \in {}^n 2\}. \end{array}$$

Suppose for contradiction that Γ is not consistent, then for some $n < \omega$, the following set is inconsistent:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma' \overset{\text{def}}{=} T \cup \{\neg(\exists \bar{x})[\vartheta(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_\eta) \wedge \vartheta(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_\nu)] : \eta, \nu \text{ incomparable in } {}^{n\geq}2\} \\ \cup \{(\exists \bar{x})[\wedge_{k\leq n} \vartheta(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_{\eta \restriction k})] : \eta \in {}^n 2\}. \end{aligned}$$

Fix such n. We pick ordinals $\alpha_\eta, \beta_\eta < \omega$ for $\eta \in {}^{n\geq}2$ so that

(i) $\nu \triangleleft \eta \implies \alpha_\nu < \alpha_\eta < \alpha_\eta + 1 < \beta_\eta < \beta_\nu$,

(ii) $\beta_{\eta \frown \langle 0 \rangle} < \alpha_{\eta \frown \langle 1 \rangle}$.

For $\eta \in {}^{n\geq}2$ let $\bar{a}^*_\eta \overset{\text{def}}{=} \bar{a}_{\alpha_\eta} \frown \bar{a}_{\beta_\eta}$. We show that $\mathfrak{C}$ and $\{\bar{a}^*_\eta : \eta \in {}^{n\geq}2\}$ exemplify that Γ' is consistent. So, if $\eta \in {}^{n\geq}2$ then we have $\bigwedge_{k\leq n} \vartheta[\bar{b}_{\alpha_\eta+1}, \bar{a}^*_{\eta\restriction k}]$ as for every $k \leq n$ we have $\alpha_{\eta\restriction k} < \alpha_\eta + 1$, so $\varphi[\bar{b}_{\alpha_\eta+1}, \bar{a}_{\alpha_{\eta\restriction k}}]$ holds, but also for all $k \leq n$, as $\eta \restriction k \trianglelefteq \eta$, we have $\beta_{\eta\restriction k} > \alpha_\eta + 1$, so $\psi[\bar{b}_{\alpha_\eta+1}, \bar{a}_{\beta_{\eta\restriction k}}]$ holds. Hence $(\exists \bar{x})[\bigwedge_{k\leq n} \vartheta(\bar{x}, \bar{a}^*_{\eta\restriction k})]$. On the other hand, if $\nu \frown \langle l \rangle \trianglelefteq \eta_l$ for $l < 2$, then $\{\vartheta(\bar{x}, \bar{a}^*_{\eta_0}), \vartheta(\bar{x}, \bar{a}^*_{\eta_1})\}$ is contradictory as the conjunction implies

$\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\beta_{\eta_0}}) \wedge \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\alpha_{\eta_1}})$, which is contradictory by $\beta_{\eta_0} < \alpha_{\eta_1}$ and (c) of Definition 2.1. This shows that Γ' is consistent, hence we have also shown that Γ is consistent.

Having shown that Γ is consistent, we can find witnesses $\{\bar{a}^*_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2\}$ in $\mathfrak{C}$ realising Γ. Now we just need to show that $\{\vartheta(\bar{x}, \bar{a}^*_{\eta\restriction n}) : n < \omega\}$ is consistent for every $\eta \in {}^{\omega}2$. This follows by the compactness theorem and the definition of Γ. Hence we have shown that $\mathrm{SOP}_3 \implies \mathrm{SOP}_2$.

The second part of the claim is obvious (and the witnesses for SOP_2 can be used for SOP_1 as well).

$\bigstar_{2.7}$

Question 2.8 Are the implications from Claim 2.7 reversible?

Claim 2.9 If T satisfies SOP_1, then T is not simple. In fact, if $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ exemplifies SOP_1 of T, then the same formula exemplifies that T has the tree property.

Proof of the Claim. Let $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ and $\{\bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2\}$ exemplify SOP_1. Then

$$\Gamma_\eta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\eta\frown\langle 0\rangle_n\frown\langle 1\rangle}) : n < \omega\}$$

for $\eta \in {}^{\omega>}2$ consists of pairwise contradictory formulae. (Here $\langle 0\rangle_n$ denotes a sequence consisting of n zeroes.) For $\nu \in {}^{n}\omega$ let

$$\rho_\nu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle 0\rangle_{\nu(0)+1} \frown \langle 1\rangle \frown \langle 0\rangle_{\nu(1)+1} \ldots \frown \langle 0\rangle_{\nu(n-1)+1} \frown \langle 1\rangle,$$

so $\rho_\nu \in {}^{\omega>}2$ and $\nu \trianglelefteq \eta \implies \rho_\nu \trianglelefteq \rho_\eta$. For $\nu \in {}^{n}\omega$ let $\bar{b}_\nu = \bar{a}_{\rho_\nu}$. We observe first that $\{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{\nu\hat{}\langle k\rangle}) : k < \omega\}$ is a set of pairwise contradictory formulae, for $\nu \in {}^{n}\omega$; namely, if $k_0 \neq k_1$, then $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{\nu\frown\langle k_l\rangle})$ for $l < 2$ are two different elements of Γ_{ρ_ν}. On the other hand, $\{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{\nu\restriction n}) : n < \omega\}$ is consistent for every $\nu \in {}^{\omega}\omega$. Hence $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ and $\{\bar{b}_\nu : \nu \in {}^{\omega>}\omega\}$ exemplify that T has the tree property, and so T is not simple. $\bigstar_{2.9}$

It turns out that witnesses to being SOP_1 can be chosen to be highly indiscernible.

Definition 2.10 (1) Given an ordinal α and sequences $\bar{\eta}_l = \langle \eta^l_0, \eta^l_1, \ldots, \eta^l_{n_l} \rangle$ for $l = 0, 1$ of members of ${}^{\alpha >}2$, we say that $\bar{\eta}_0 \approx_1 \bar{\eta}_1$ iff

(a) $n_0 = n_1$,

(b) the truth values of

$$\eta^l_{k_3} \trianglelefteq \eta^l_{k_1} \cap \eta^l_{k_2}, \quad \eta^l_{k_1} \cap \eta^l_{k_2} \triangleleft \eta^l_{k_3}, \quad (\eta^l_{k_1} \cap \eta^l_{k_2}) \frown \langle 0 \rangle \trianglelefteq \eta^l_{k_3},$$

for $k_1, k_2, k_3 \leq n_0$, do not depend on l.

(2) We say that the sequence $\langle \bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\alpha >}2 \rangle$ of $\mathfrak{C}$ (for an ordinal α) are *1-fully binary tree indiscernible (1-fbti)* iff whenever $\bar{\eta}_0 \approx_1 \bar{\eta}_1$ are sequences of elements of ${}^{\alpha >}2$, then

$$\bar{a}_{\bar{\eta}_0} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \bar{a}_{\eta^0_0} \frown \ldots \frown \bar{a}_{\eta^0_{n_0}}$$

and the similarly defined $\bar{a}_{\bar{\eta}_1}$, realise the same type in $\mathfrak{C}$.
(3) We replace 1 by 2 in the above definitions iff $(\eta^l_{k_1} \cap \eta^l_{k_2}) \frown \langle 0 \rangle \trianglelefteq \eta^l_{k_3}$ is omitted from clause (b) above.

Claim 2.11 If $t \in \{1, 2\}$ and $\langle \bar{b}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega >}2 \rangle$ are given, and $\delta \geq \omega$, then we can find $\langle \bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\delta >}2 \rangle$ such that

(a) $\langle \bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\delta >}2 \rangle$ is t-fbti,

(b) if $\bar{\eta} = \langle \eta_m : m < n \rangle$, where each $\eta_m \in {}^{\delta >}2$ is given, and Δ is a finite set of formulae of T, then we can find $\nu_m \in {}^{\omega >}2 \, (m < n)$ such that with $\bar{\nu} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \langle \nu_m : m < n \rangle$, we have $\bar{\nu} \approx_t \bar{\eta}$ and the sequences $\bar{a}_{\bar{\eta}}$ and $\bar{b}_{\bar{\nu}}$, realise the same Δ-types.

Proof of the Claim. The proof goes through a series of steps through which we obtain increasing degrees of indiscernibility. We shall need some auxiliary definitions.

Definition 2.12 (1) Given $\bar{\eta} = \langle \eta_0, \ldots, \eta_{k-1} \rangle$, a sequence of elements of ${}^{\alpha >}2$, and an ordinal γ. We define $\bar{\eta}' = \mathrm{cl}_\gamma(\bar{\eta})$ as follows:

$$\bar{\eta}' = \langle \eta_0, \eta_0 \restriction \gamma, \eta_1, \eta_1 \restriction \gamma, \eta_0 \cap \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_2 \restriction \gamma, \eta_0 \cap \eta_2, \eta_1 \cap \eta_2 \ldots \rangle.$$

(2) We say that $\bar{\eta} \approx_{\gamma, n} \bar{\nu}$ iff $\bar{\eta}' \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{cl}_\gamma(\bar{\eta})$ and $\bar{\nu}' \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{cl}_\gamma(\bar{\nu})$ satisfy

(i) $\bar{\eta}' = \langle \eta'_l : l < m \rangle$ and $\bar{\nu}' = \langle \nu'_l : l < m \rangle$ are both in ${}^m({}^{\alpha>}2)$ for some m,

(ii) for $l < m$ we have $\eta'_l \in {}^{\gamma\geq}2 \iff \nu'_l \in {}^{\gamma\geq}2$, and for such l we have $\eta'_l = \nu'_l$,

(iii) $n \geq |u_1| = |u_2|$, where we let $u_1 = \{lg(\eta'_l) : l < m\} \setminus (\gamma + 1)$ and $u_2 = \{lg(\nu'_l) : l < m\} \setminus (\gamma + 1)$,

(iv) $lg(\eta'_l) \in u_1 \implies |u_1 \cap lg(\eta'_l)| = |u_2 \cap lg(\nu'_l)|$,

(v) $\eta'_{l_1} \trianglelefteq \eta'_{l_2} \iff \nu'_{l_1} \trianglelefteq \nu'_{l_2}$, and the same holds for the equality,

(vi) $\eta'_{l_1}\hat{}\langle 0 \rangle \trianglelefteq \eta'_{l_2} \iff \nu'_{l_1}\hat{}\langle 0 \rangle \trianglelefteq \nu'_{l_2}$ (and hence the same holds with 1 in place of 0).

(3) $\langle \bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\alpha>}2 \rangle$ is (γ, n)-*indiscernible* iff for every $\bar{\eta}, \bar{\nu} \in {}^k({}^{\alpha>}2)$ with $\bar{\eta} \approx_{(\gamma,n)} \bar{\nu}$, the tuples $\bar{a}_{\bar{\eta}}$ and $\bar{a}_{\bar{\nu}}$ realise the same type.
(4) $(\leq \gamma, n)$-*indiscernibility* is the conjunction of (β, n)-indiscernibility for all $\beta \leq \gamma$.
(5) We say that $\langle \bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\alpha>}2 \rangle$ is 0-*fbti* iff it is (γ, n)-indiscernible for all γ and n.

Subclaim 2.13 If $\bar{a}_\eta \in {}^k\mathfrak{C}$ for $\eta \in {}^{\omega>}2$, then we can find $\bar{a}' = \langle \bar{a}'_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\alpha>}2 \rangle$ such that

(x) $\bar{a}'$ is 0-fbti,

(xx) for every n and a finite set Δ of formulae, we can find $h : {}^{n\geq}2 \to {}^{\omega>}2$ such that

(α) $\langle \bar{a}'_\eta : \eta \in {}^{n\geq}2 \rangle$ and $\langle \bar{a}_{h(\eta)} : \eta \in {}^{n\geq}2 \rangle$ realise the same Δ-type,

(β) h satisfies $h(\eta)\hat{}\langle l \rangle \trianglelefteq h(\eta\hat{}\langle l \rangle)$ for $\eta \in {}^{n>}2$ and $l < 2$, and

$$lg(\eta_1) = lg(\eta_2) \implies lg(h(\eta_1)) = lg(h(\eta_2)).$$

Proof of the Subclaim. Let $(*)_{\gamma,n}$ be the conjunction of the statement $(x)_{\gamma,n}$ given by

$$\bar{a}' \text{ is } (\leq \gamma, n)\text{-indiscernible},$$

and (xx) above. We prove by induction on n that for any $\gamma \leq \omega$ we can find $\bar{a}'$ for which $(*)_{\gamma,n}$ holds.

$\underline{n=0}$. We use $\bar{a}'_\eta = \bar{a}_\eta$.

$\underline{n+1}$. By induction on $\gamma \leq \omega$, we prove that there is $\bar{a}'$ for which $(*)_{\gamma,n+1} + (*)_{\omega,n} + (xx)$ holds.

$\underline{\gamma = 0}$ (or just $\gamma < \omega$).

Without loss of generality, the sequence $\langle \bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2 \rangle$ is $(\leq \omega, n)$-indiscernible and $(< \gamma, n+1)$-indiscernible, by the transitivity of (xx) as a relation between $\langle \bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2 \rangle$ and $\langle \bar{a}'_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2 \rangle$. Suppose we are given $\bar{\eta}, \bar{\nu}$ satisfying $\bar{\eta} \approx_{\gamma,n+1} \bar{\nu}$, in particular the appropriately defined u_1, u_2 have size $\leq n+1$. For simplicity in notation, we assume $\bar{\eta}, \bar{\nu}$ to be the same as their cl_γ closures.

If $|u_1| \leq n$, the conclusion follows by the assumptions. Moreover, if $\min(u_1) = \min(u_2)$ and $lg(\eta_l) = \min(u_1) \implies \eta_l = \nu_l$, using $(x)_{\min(u_1),n}$, we get the equivalence. So, fixing a finite set Δ of formulae and $k < \omega$, for every $\bar{\eta}$, defining u_1 appropriately, we get that the $\mathrm{tp}_\Delta(\bar{a}_{\bar{\eta}})$ depends just on the $\bar{\eta}/\approx_{\gamma,n+1} \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \Upsilon$ and $\{\eta_l : l < lg(\bar{\eta})\} \cap {}^{\min(u_1)}2 = \{\eta_l : l \in v^\Upsilon\}$ for some $v^\Upsilon \subseteq lg(\bar{\eta})$. Let us define $F^0_{\Upsilon,\Delta}$ by $F^0_{\Upsilon,\Delta}(\langle \eta_l : l \in v^\Upsilon \rangle) = \mathrm{tp}_\Delta(\bar{a}_{\bar{\eta}})$. By the closure properties of $\bar{\eta}$, we get that $\eta_{l_1} \neq \eta_{l_2} \implies \eta_{l_1} \restriction (\gamma+1) = \eta_{l_2} \restriction (\gamma+1)$ for $l_1, l_2 \in v^\Upsilon$. We can hence replace v^Υ by a set $v^\Upsilon_* \subseteq v^\Upsilon$ such that $\langle \eta_l : l \in v^\Upsilon_* \rangle$ are the representatives under equality of restrictions to $\gamma+1$.

As we have fixed Δ, the set of relevant Υ is finite. Let $k^* = 2^{\gamma+1}$ (so finite) and let $\{\nu^*_k : k < k^*\}$ list ${}^{\gamma+1}2$. We define

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\Upsilon,\Delta}(\nu_0, \dots, \nu_k, \dots)_{k<k^*} &\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} F^0_{\Upsilon,\Delta}(\langle \eta_l : l \in v^\Upsilon_* \rangle), \\ &\qquad \text{where } \eta_l \restriction (\gamma+1) = \nu^*_k \implies \eta_l = \nu^*_k \frown \nu_k. \end{aligned}$$

Define a function F with arity k^* so that $F((\dots, x_k, \dots)_{k<k^*})$ is defined iff for some $m < \omega$ we have $\{x_k : k < k^*\} \subseteq {}^m2$ and then

$$F((\dots, x_k, \dots)_{k<k^*}) = \langle F_{\Upsilon,\Delta}((\dots, x_k, \dots)_{k<k^*}) : \Upsilon \text{ as above } \rangle.$$

Now we use the Halpern-Lauchli [HaLa] theorem. We get a set of functions $h_k : {}^{\omega>}2 \to {}^{\omega>}2$ for $k < k^*$ such that

- $lg(h_k(\eta))$ depends just on $lg(\eta)$ (not on k or on the values taken by η),

- $h_k(\eta) \frown \langle l\rangle \lhd h_k(\eta \frown \langle l\rangle)$ for $l = 0, 1$,
- for some c we have

$$(m < \omega \ \& \ \{\eta_k : k < k^*\} \subseteq {}^{m}2) \implies F((\eta_0, \eta_1, \ldots, \eta_k, \ldots)_{k<k^*}) = c.$$

Let $\bar{a}'_\eta$ for $\eta \in {}^{\omega>}2$ be defined to be: $\bar{a}_\eta$ if $\eta \in {}^{\gamma\geq}2$, and $\bar{a}_{h_k(\nu)}$ if $\eta \restriction \gamma = \nu^*_k$ and $\eta = \nu^*_k \frown \nu$. We obtain the desired conclusion, but localized to Δ. The induction step ends by an application of the compactness theorem.

$\underline{\gamma = \omega}$ Follows by the induction hypothesis and the compactness.

The conclusion of the Subclaim follows by the compactness theorem. $\bigstar_{2.13}$

Now we go *back to the proof of the Claim*. Let us first work with $t = 1$. Given $\langle \bar{b}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2\rangle$ as in the assumptions, by the Subclaim we can assume that they are 0-fbti. We choose by induction on n a function $h_n : {}^{n\geq}2 \to {}^{\omega>}2$ as follows. Let $h_0(\langle\rangle) = \langle\rangle$. If h_n is defined, let

$$k_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max\{lg(h_n(\eta)) + 1 : \eta \in {}^{n\geq}2\}$$

and let

$$h_{n+1}(\langle\rangle) = \langle\rangle, \quad h_{n+1}(\langle 1\rangle\hat{\ }\nu) = \langle 1\rangle\hat{\ }h_n(\nu), \quad h_{n+1}(\langle 0\rangle\hat{\ }\nu) = \langle 0, \ldots, 0\rangle\hat{\ }h_n(\nu),$$

where the sequence of 0s in the last part of the definition, has length k_n. Now we can check that $\langle \bar{b}_{h_n(\eta)} : \eta \in {}^{n\geq}2\rangle$ are 1-fbti, for each n. Hence, we can finish by compactness.

For $t = 2$, we use the same proof, except that we let

$$h_{n+1}(\langle 1\rangle\hat{\ }\nu) = \langle 0, 1\rangle\hat{\ }h_n(\nu).$$

$\bigstar_{2.11}$

Claim 2.14 If $t \in \{1, 2\}$ and $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ exemplifies that T has SOP_t, we can without loss of generality assume that the witnesses $\langle \bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2\rangle$ for this fact are t-fbti.

Proof of the Claim. Let $\bar{b} = \langle \bar{b}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2 \rangle$ be any witnesses to the fact that $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ exemplifies that T has SOP_t. Let $\bar{a} = \langle \bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2 \rangle$ be t-fbti and satisfy the properties guaranteed by Claim 2.11. We check that $\bar{a}$ satisfies the properties (a) and (b) from the Definition of SOP_t.

For (a), we first work with $t = 1$, the case $t = 2$ is similar. Let $\rho \in {}^{\omega}2$ be given, and suppose that $\{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\rho \restriction n}) : n < \omega\}$ is inconsistent. Then there is some $n^* < \omega$ such that $\{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\rho \restriction n}) : n < n^*\}$ is inconsistent. Let $\bar{\rho} = \langle \rho \restriction n : n < n^* \rangle$, and let

$$\Delta \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{\varphi^*_n((\bar{y}_0, \dots \bar{y}_k, \dots)_{k<n^*})\} \text{ where } \varphi^*_{n^*} \equiv (\exists \bar{x}) \wedge_{k<n^*} \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_k).$$

Let $\bar{\nu} \approx_t \bar{\rho}$ be such that $\bar{b}_{\bar{\nu}}$ and $\bar{a}_{\bar{\rho}}$ realise the same Δ-types. As $\bar{\nu} \approx_t \bar{\rho}$ we have that $\bar{\nu} = \langle \nu_0, \nu_1, \dots \nu_{n^*-1} \rangle$ for some $\nu_0, \nu_1, \dots \nu_{n^*-1}$ satisfying

$$i < j < n^* \implies \nu_i \trianglelefteq \nu_j.$$

Let $\eta \in {}^{\omega}2$ be such that $\nu_i \trianglelefteq \eta$ for all i. Hence $\{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{\eta \restriction n}) : n < \omega\}$ is consistent, so in particular

$$\models \text{“}(\exists \bar{x})[\wedge_{n<n^*} \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{\nu_n})]\text{”}.$$

Hence

$$\models \text{“}(\exists \bar{x})[\wedge_{n<n^*} \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\rho \restriction n})]\text{”},$$

a contradiction.

For (b), suppose that $\eta_0 \frown \langle 0 \rangle \trianglelefteq \eta$ and let $\bar{\eta} = \langle \eta_0, \eta, \eta_0 \frown \langle 1 \rangle \rangle$, while $\Delta = \{\varphi^*_2(\bar{y}_0, \bar{y}_1)\}$. Let $\bar{\nu} = \langle \nu_0, \nu_1, \nu_2 \rangle$ be such that $\bar{\eta} \approx_t \bar{\nu}$ and $\bar{b}_{\bar{\nu}}$ realises the same Δ-types as $\bar{a}_{\bar{\eta}}$. If $t = 1$, as $\bar{\nu} \approx_t \bar{\eta}$ we have $\nu_0 \frown \langle 0 \rangle \trianglelefteq \nu_2$, hence $\{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{\nu_0 \frown \langle 1 \rangle}), \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_\nu)\}$ is contradictory, hence $\{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\eta_0 \frown \langle 1 \rangle}), \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_\eta)\}$ is contradictory. The case $t = 2$ is similar, as the notion of incompatibility in ${}^{\omega>}2$ can be encaptured by a relevant choice of $\bar{\eta}$. $\bigstar_{2.14}$

The next claim shows that in the case of theories which are SOP_1 and NSOP_2, the witnesses to being SOP_1 can be chosen to be particularly nice.

Claim 2.15 Suppose that $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ satisfies SOP_1, but for no n does the formula $\varphi_n(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_0, \dots, \bar{y}_{n-1}) \equiv \wedge \varphi_{k<n} \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_k)$ satisfy SOP_2. Then there are witnesses $\langle \bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2 \rangle$ for $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ satisfying SOP_1 which in addition satisfy:

(c) if $X \subseteq {}^{\omega>}2$, and there are no $\eta, \nu \in X$ such that $\eta \frown \langle 0 \rangle \trianglelefteq \nu$, then $\{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_\eta) : \eta \in X\}$ is consistent.

(d) $\langle \bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2 \rangle$ is 1-fbti.

(In particular, such a formula and witnesses can be found for any theory satisfying SOP_1 and NSOP_2.)

Proof of the Claim. Let $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ be a SOP_1 formula which is not SOP_2, and moreover assume that for no n does the formula φ_n defined as above satisfy SOP_2. By Claim 2.14, we can find witnesses $\langle \bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2 \rangle$ which are 1-fbti. By the compactness theorem, we can assume that we have a 1-fbti sequence $\langle \bar{a}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega_1>}2 \rangle$ with the properties corresponding to (a) and (b) of Definition 2.2(2), namely

(a) for every $\eta \in {}^{\omega_1}2$, the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\eta \restriction \alpha}) : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ is consistent,

(b) if $\nu \frown \langle 0 \rangle \trianglelefteq \eta \in {}^{\omega_1>}2$, then $\{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\nu \frown \langle 1 \rangle}), \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_\eta)\}$ is inconsistent.

We shall now attempt to choose ν_η and w_η for $\eta \in {}^{\omega_1>}2$, by induction on $lg(\eta) = \alpha < \omega_1$ so that:

(i) $\nu_{\langle\rangle} \in {}^{\omega_1>}2$,

(ii) $\beta < \alpha \implies \nu_{\eta \restriction \beta} \triangleleft \nu_\eta$,

(iii) $\beta < \alpha \implies \nu_\eta(lg(\nu_\eta \restriction \beta)) = \eta(\beta)$,

(iv) $w_\eta \subseteq {}^{\omega_1>}2$ is finite and $\nu \in w_\eta \implies lg(\nu) < lg(\nu_\eta)$,

(v) if $lg(\eta)$ is a limit ordinal, then $w_\eta = \emptyset$,

(vi) if $\eta \in {}^{\beta}2$ and $l < 2$, then $w_{\eta \frown \langle l \rangle} \subseteq \{\rho \in {}^{\omega_1>}2 : \nu_\eta \frown \langle l \rangle \trianglelefteq \rho\}$ and $\max\{lg(\rho) : \rho \in w_{\eta \frown \langle l \rangle}\} < lg(\nu_{\eta \frown \langle l \rangle})$,

(vii) for each η there is $\rho^* = \rho^*_\eta$ such that

- (α) $\nu_\eta \triangleleft \rho^* \in {}^{\omega_1}2$,
- (β) $|\{\alpha < \omega_1 : \rho^*(\alpha) = 1\}| = \aleph_1$,

(γ) letting

$$p_\eta(\bar{x}) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_\Upsilon) : \Upsilon \in w_{\eta\restriction\gamma} \text{ for some } \gamma \leq lg(\eta)\},$$

we have that for all large enough β^*, the set

$$p_\eta(\bar{x}) \cup \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\rho^*\restriction\beta}) : \beta > \beta^* \ \wedge\ \rho^*(\beta) = 1\}$$

is consistent,

(viii) $p_\eta(\bar{x}) \cup \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_\rho) : \rho \in w_{\eta\frown\langle 0\rangle} \cup w_{\eta\frown\langle 1\rangle}\}$ is inconsistent.

Before proceeding, we make several remarks about this definition. Firstly, requirements (vii) and (viii) taken together imply that for each $\eta \in {}^{\omega_1>}2$ we have that $w_{\eta\frown\langle 0\rangle} \cup w_{\eta\frown\langle 1\rangle} \neq \emptyset$. Secondly, the definition of $w_{\eta\frown\langle l\rangle}$ for $l \in \{0, 1\}$ implies that

$$\wedge_{l=0,1} \rho_l \in w_{\eta\frown\langle l\rangle} \implies \rho_0 \perp \rho_1.$$

Thirdly, in (vii), any ρ^* which satisfies that $\nu_\eta \triangleleft \rho^*$ and $|\{\gamma : \rho^*(\gamma) = 1\}| = \aleph_1$ can be chosen as ρ^*_η, by indiscernibility.

Now let us assume that a choice as above is possible, and we have made it. Hence for each $\eta \in {}^{\omega_1>}2$ there is a finite $q_\eta \subseteq p_\eta$ such that

$$q_\eta(\bar{x}) \cup \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_\rho) : \rho \in w_{\eta\frown\langle 0\rangle} \cup w_{\eta\frown\langle 1\rangle}\} \tag{$*$}$$

is inconsistent. Notice that there are q and $\eta^* \in {}^{\omega_1}2$ such that

$$(\forall \eta_1)[\eta^* \trianglelefteq \eta_1 \in {}^{\omega_1>}2 \implies (\exists \eta_2 \in {}^{\omega_1>}2)(\eta_1 \trianglelefteq \eta_2 \ \wedge\ q_{\eta_2} = q)].$$

Namely, otherwise, we would have the following: each p_η is countable, hence for every η there is $g(\eta)$ with $\eta \trianglelefteq g(\eta) \in {}^{\omega_1>}2$ and

$$g(\eta) \trianglelefteq \eta_1 \implies q_{\eta_1} \not\subseteq p_\eta.$$

Let $\eta_0 \overset{\text{def}}{=} \langle\rangle$, and for $n < \omega$ let $\eta_{n+1} = g(\eta_n)$. Let $\eta \overset{\text{def}}{=} \cup_{n<\omega} \eta_n$, hence $p_\eta = \cup_{n<\omega} p_{\eta_n}$ (as $w_\eta = \emptyset$), and so $q_\eta \subseteq p_{\eta_n}$ for some n, a contradiction.

Having found such q, η^*, by renaming we can assume that $\eta^* \overset{\text{def}}{=} \langle\rangle$ and that for all η we have $q_\eta = p_{\langle\rangle} = q$ (as $\eta \trianglelefteq \nu \implies p_\eta \subseteq p_\nu$). For $\eta \in {}^{\omega_1>}2$

let $\bar{\tau}_\eta$ list w_η. Without loss of generality, by thinning and renaming, we have that for all η_1, η_2,

$$\langle \nu_{\eta_1} \rangle \frown \bar{\tau}_{\eta_1 \frown \langle 0 \rangle} \frown \bar{\tau}_{\eta_1 \frown \langle 1 \rangle} \approx_1 \langle \nu_{\eta_2} \rangle \frown \bar{\tau}_{\eta_2 \frown \langle 0 \rangle} \frown \bar{\tau}_{\eta_2 \frown \langle 1 \rangle}.$$

(We are using the following colouring theorem: if $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) = \kappa$ and we colour ${}^{\kappa>}2$ by $\theta < \kappa$ colours, then there is an embedding $h : {}^{\omega>}2 \to {}^{\kappa>}2$ such that $h(\eta)\hat{}\langle l \rangle \trianglelefteq h(\eta)\hat{}\langle l \rangle$ and $\mathrm{Rang}(h)$ is monochromatic.) Similarly to the proof of Claim 2.4, we can define a formula $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ and $\{\bar{b}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2\}$ such that

$$\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_\eta) \equiv \bigwedge q \wedge \bigwedge \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_\rho) : \rho \in w_\eta\}.$$

We claim that $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ and $\langle \bar{b}_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}2 \rangle$ exemplify SOP_2 of T, which is then a contradiction (noting that ψ is a formula of the form φ_n for some n, where φ_n was defined in the statement of the Claim). We check the two properties from Definition 2.2(1).

To see (a), let $\eta \in {}^{\omega}2$ be given. We have that p_η is consistent, and $q \subseteq p_\eta$. For $n < \omega$, we have

$$\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{\eta \restriction n}) \equiv \bigwedge q \wedge \bigwedge \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_\rho) : \rho \in w_{\eta \restriction n}\}.$$

As this is a conjunction of a set of formulae each of which is from p_η, we have that $\{\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{\eta \restriction n}) : n < \omega\}$ is consistent. To check (b), suppose $\eta \perp \nu \in {}^{\omega>}2$. Let n be such that $\eta \restriction n = \nu \restriction n$ but $\eta(n) \neq \nu(n)$. Hence

$$\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_\eta) \equiv \bigwedge q \wedge \bigwedge \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_\rho) : \rho \in w_{\eta \restriction n \frown \eta(n)}\}$$

and

$$\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_\nu) \equiv \bigwedge q \wedge \bigwedge \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_\rho) : \rho \in w_{\eta \restriction n \frown \nu(n)}\},$$

so taken together, the two are contradictory by the choice of q.

We conclude that the choice of ν_η and w_η cannot be carried throughout $\eta \in {}^{\omega_1>}2$. So, there is $\alpha < \omega_1$ and $\eta \in {}^{\alpha}2$ such that $\nu_\eta, w_{\eta \frown \langle l \rangle}, \nu_{\eta \frown \langle l \rangle}$ for $l < 2$ cannot be chosen, and α is the first ordinal for which there is such η. Let $\nu^0_\eta \in {}^{\omega_1}2 \triangleright \cup_{\beta<\alpha} \nu_{\eta \restriction \beta} \frown \eta \restriction (\alpha - 1)$ if the latter part is defined, otherwise let $\nu^0_\eta \triangleright \cup_{\beta<\alpha} \nu_{\eta \restriction \beta}$. This choice of $\nu_\eta = \rho$ for any $\rho \restriction \nu^0_\eta$ satisfies items (i)-(iii) above. We conclude that $w_{\eta\frown\langle l\rangle}$ for $l < 2$ using any $\rho \restriction \nu^0_\eta$ for ν_η could not have been chosen, and examine why this is so. Note that p_η is already defined. Let

$$\Theta \overset{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\rho, \gamma, w) : \nu^0_\eta \triangleleft \rho \in {}^{\omega_1}2, \\ \qquad\qquad lg(\nu^0_\eta) \le \gamma < \omega_1, \\ \qquad\qquad (\exists^{\aleph_1} \beta < \omega_1)(\rho(\beta) = 1), \\ \qquad\qquad w \subseteq \{\Upsilon \in {}^{\omega_1>}2 : \ \rho \restriction \gamma \trianglelefteq \Upsilon\} \text{ is finite and} \\ \qquad\qquad \text{ for some } \beta_\rho < \beta \text{ the set} \\ \qquad\qquad p_\eta \cup \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\rho\restriction\beta}) : \ \rho(\beta) = 1 \ \& \ \beta \in [\beta_\rho, \omega_1)\} \cup \\ \qquad\qquad \cup \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_\Upsilon) : \ \Upsilon \in w\} \\ \qquad\qquad \text{ is consistent} \end{array} \right\}.$$

We make several **observations**:

(0) If $(\rho, \gamma, w) \in \Theta$ and $w \subseteq w'$ with w' finite and $w' \setminus w$ is contained in $\{\rho \restriction \beta : \ \beta_\rho \gamma \le \beta \ \wedge \ \rho(\beta) = 1\}$, then $(\rho, \gamma, w') \in \Theta$.

[This is obvious.]

(1) If $(\rho_l, \gamma_l, w_l) \in \Theta$ and for some $\sigma \in {}^{\omega_1>}2$ with $\nu^0_\eta \trianglelefteq \sigma$ we have $\sigma \frown \langle l \rangle \triangleleft \rho_l \restriction \gamma$ for $l < 2$, while ρ_0 and ρ_1 are eventually equal, then $(\rho_l, lg(\sigma), w_1 \cup w_2) \in \Theta$.

[Why? We have $w_l \subseteq \{\Upsilon \in {}^{\omega_1>}2 : \ \rho_l \restriction \gamma \trianglelefteq \Upsilon\}$ is finite, so clearly $w_0 \cup w_1 \subseteq \{\Upsilon \in {}^{\omega_1>}2 : \ \sigma \trianglelefteq \Upsilon\}$ is finite. By the assumption, we have that for some $\beta_l < \omega_1$ for $l < 2$

$$p_\eta \cup \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\rho_l \restriction \beta}) : \ \beta > \beta_l \ \wedge \ \rho_l(\beta) = 1\} \cup \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_\Upsilon) : \ \Upsilon \in w_l\}$$

is consistent. Suppose that (1) is not true and let $\beta^* \ge \max\{\beta_0, \beta_1\}$ be such that $\beta^* < \omega_1$ and for $\beta > \beta^*$ the equality $\rho_0(\beta) = \rho_1(\beta)$ holds. Hence we have that

$$p_\eta \cup \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\rho_l \restriction \beta}) : \ \beta > \beta^* \ \wedge \ \rho_0(\beta) = 1\} \cup \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_\Upsilon) : \ \Upsilon \in w_0 \cup w_1\}$$

is inconsistent. By increasing w_0 if necessary, (0) implies that

$$p_\eta \cup \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_\Upsilon) : \ \Upsilon \in w_0 \cup w_1\}$$

is inconsistent. Let $\nu_\eta \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sigma$, for $l < 2$ let $w_{\eta\frown\langle l\rangle} = w_l$, and let $\nu_{\eta\frown\langle l\rangle} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \rho_l \restriction \beta^*_l$ for a large enough β^*_l so that $\beta^* < \beta^*_l$ and $\max(\{lg(\Upsilon) : \ \Upsilon \in w_{\eta\frown\langle l\rangle}\}) < \beta^*_l$.

This choice shows that we could have chosen $\nu_\eta, w_{\eta \frown \langle l \rangle}$ and $\nu_{\eta \frown \langle l \rangle}$ as required, contradicting the choice of η.]
(2) If $\nu^0_\eta \lhd \rho \in {}^{\omega_1}2$ for some ρ such that there are $\aleph_1$ many $\beta < \omega_1$ with $\rho(\beta) = 1$, and $lg(\nu^0_\eta) \leq \gamma < \omega_1$, then $(\rho, \gamma, \emptyset) \in \Theta$.

[Why? By the choice of p_η and the remark about the freedom in the choice of ρ^* that we made earlier.]

Now we use the choice of η to define witnesses to T being SOP$_1$ which also satisfy the requirements of the Claim. For $\tau \in {}^{\omega >}2$, let $\bar{b}_\tau \overset{\text{def}}{=} \bar{a}_{\nu^0_\eta \frown \tau}$. Let us check the required properties. Properties (a),(b) and (d) follow from the choice of $\{\bar{a}_\sigma : \sigma \in {}^{\omega >}2\}$. Let $X^* \subseteq {}^{\omega >}2$ be such that there are no $\sigma, \nu \in X^*$ with $\sigma \frown \langle 0 \rangle \trianglelefteq \nu$, we need to show that $\{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_\tau) : \tau \in X^*\}$ is consistent. It suffices to show the same holds when X^* replaced by an arbitrary finite $X \subseteq X^*$. Fix such an X. Clearly, it suffices to show that for some ρ, γ, letting $w = \{\nu^0_\eta \frown \tau : \tau \in X\}$, we have $(\rho, \gamma, w) \in \Theta$.

Let $\rho^* \in {}^{\omega_1}2$ be such that $\nu^0_\eta \lhd \rho^*$ and $\rho^*(\beta) = 1$ for $\aleph_1$ many β. By induction on $n \overset{\text{def}}{=} |X|$ we show:

there is $\rho \in {}^{\omega_1}2$ such that for some $\gamma \geq \max\{lg(\sigma) : \sigma \in w\}$, we have $(\rho, \gamma, w) \in \Theta$ and $\beta > \gamma \implies \rho(\beta) = \rho^*(\beta)$, while $\rho(\gamma) = 1$.

$n = 0$. Follows by Observation (2) above.

$n = 1$. Let $X = \{\tau\}$ and $\gamma = lg(\tau) + lg(\nu^0_\tau)$. Let $\rho \in {}^{\omega_1}2$ be such that $\rho \restriction \gamma = \nu^0_\eta \frown \tau$, $\rho(\gamma) = 1$ and $\beta > \gamma \implies \rho(\beta) = \rho^*(\beta)$. By Observation (2) above, we have that $(\rho, \gamma, \emptyset) \in w$. Then, by Observation (0), we have $(\rho, \gamma, w) \in \Theta$.

$n = k + 1 \geq 2$. *Case 1.* w is linearly ordered by $\lhd$.

Let $\tau \in w$ be of maximal length, so clearly $\sigma \in w \setminus \{\tau\} \implies \sigma \frown \langle 1 \rangle \trianglelefteq \tau$. Let $\rho \in {}^{\omega_1}2$ be such that $\tau \frown \langle 1 \rangle \lhd \rho$ and $\beta > lg(\tau)$, while $\rho(\beta) = \rho^*(\beta)$. Now continue as in the case $n = 1$.

Case 2. Not Case 1.

Let $\sigma \in {}^{\omega_1 >}2$ be $\lhd$-maximal such that $(\forall \tau)(\tau \in w \implies \sigma \trianglelefteq \tau)$. This is well defined, as $w \neq \emptyset$. Let $w_l \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{\tau \in w : \sigma \frown \langle l \rangle \trianglelefteq \tau\}$, so $w_0 \cap w_1 = \emptyset$ but neither of w_0, w_1 is empty. Now we have that $\sigma \notin w$, as otherwise we could choose $\tau \in w_0$ such that $\sigma \frown \langle 0 \rangle \trianglelefteq \tau$, obtaining an easy contradiction to our assumptions on X. Hence $w = w_0 \cup w_1$. We can now use Observation (1) and the inductive hypothesis. $\bigstar_{2.15}$

3 $\triangleleft^*$-maximality revisited

In this section we introduce $\triangleleft^{**}_\lambda$, which is a version of $\triangleleft^*_\lambda$-order considered in the first section, and give a connection between the $\triangleleft^{**}_\lambda$-maximal complete first order theories T when $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) > |T|$ and a property similar to SOP_2. The proof generalises the one in §1.

Definition 3.1 (1) For complete first order theories T_1, T_2 and a regular cardinal $\lambda > |T_1|, |T_2|$, let $T_1 \triangleleft^{**}_\lambda T_2$ mean:

There is a λ-relevant (T_1, T_2)-superior $(T^*, \bar\varphi, \bar\psi)$ (see Definition 1.3) such that T^* has Skolem functions and if $T^{**} \supseteq T^*$ is complete with $|T^{**}| < \lambda$ then

($\oplus$) there is a model M of T^* of size λ and an $M^{[\bar\varphi]}$-type p omitted by M such that for every elementary extension N of M of size λ which omits p, and a 1-type q over $N^{[\bar\psi]}$ such that every elementary extension of N of size λ which realises q, realises p.

(2) Let $T_1 \triangleleft^{**} T_2$ mean that $T_1 \triangleleft^{**}_\lambda T_2$ holds for all large enough regular λ.

Claim 3.2 For a given a regular cardinal $\lambda > |T_1|, |T_2|$, if $T_1 \triangleleft^*_{\lambda^+} T_2$, and $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$, then $T_1 \triangleleft^{**}_\lambda T_2$.

Proof. This statement is just a reformulation of the beginning of the proof of Theorem 1.17. Namely, let $(T^*, \bar\varphi, \bar\psi)$ be a λ-relevant (T_1, T_2)-superior exemplifying that $T_1 \triangleleft^*_{\lambda^+} T_2$. Without loss of generality T^* has Skolem functions. Suppose $\neg(T_1 \triangleleft^{**}_\lambda T_2)$, and let T^{**} exemplify this for $(T^*, \bar\varphi, \bar\psi)$. By extending if necessary, we can assume that $T^* = T^{**}$. Let $M \models T^*$ be of size λ, and let p be an $M^{[\bar\varphi]}$ type omitted by M. Then for every elementary extension N of M of size λ which omits p, and every 1-type q over $N^{[\bar\psi]}$, there is an elementary extension N^* of N of size λ, which omits p and realises q. By induction, we can build an elementary extension N of M with $|N| = \lambda^+$, with N omitting p and being $\bar\psi$-saturated for 1-types with parameters in N (we are using $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$). This is a contradiction with the choice of T^*. $\bigstar_{3.2}$

Definition 3.3 We say that T is $\triangleleft^{**}_\lambda$-maximal iff there is no T^+ such that $T \triangleleft^{**}_\lambda T^+$.

Main Theorem 3.4 For a theory T, the following implications hold:

$$\text{(b)} \implies \text{(a)}_\lambda \implies \text{(c)}_\lambda \iff \text{(d)},$$

where

(a)$_\lambda$ $\lambda > |T|$ is regular and T is $\triangleleft^{**}_\lambda$-maximal.

(b) For every regular $\lambda > |T|$, the theory T is $\triangleleft^{**}_\lambda$-maximal.

(c)$_\lambda$ $\lambda > |T|$ is regular and

there is a formula $\sigma(x, \bar{y})$, and a sequence

$\Big\langle \bar{e}_{\bar{\eta}} : \bar{\eta} = \langle \eta_0, \dots \eta_{n^*-1} \rangle, \eta_0 \triangleleft \eta_1 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft \eta_{n^*-1} \in {}^{\lambda >}\lambda \text{ and } lg(\eta_i) \text{ a successor} \Big\rangle$

such that

(α) for each $\eta \in {}^{\lambda}\lambda$, the set

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \sigma(x, \bar{e}_{\bar{\eta}}) : \bar{\eta} = \langle \eta \restriction (\alpha_0 + 1), \eta \restriction (\alpha_1 + 1), \dots \eta \restriction (\alpha_{n^*-1} + 1) \rangle \\ \text{and } \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \dots \alpha_{n^*-1} < \lambda \end{array} \right\}$$

is consistent

(β) for every large enough m, if $g : {}^{n^* \geq}m \to {}^{\lambda >}\lambda$ satisfies

$$\rho \triangleleft \nu \implies g(\rho) \triangleleft g(\nu)$$

and

$$\rho \in {}^{n \geq}m \implies lg(g(\rho)) \text{ is a successor},$$

while for $l < n^* - 1$

$$(g(\rho)) \frown \langle l \rangle \trianglelefteq g(\rho \frown \langle l \rangle),$$

then

$$\{\sigma(x, \bar{e}_{\langle g(\rho \restriction 1), g(\rho \restriction 2), \dots g(\rho) \rangle}) : \rho \in {}^{n^*}m\}$$

is inconsistent. Here $n^* = lg(\bar{y})$ in $\sigma(x, \bar{y})$.

(d) For every regular λ, $(c)_\lambda$ holds.

Proof. The statement $(b) \implies (a)_\lambda$ for any fixed regular λ is obvious, as is $(d) \implies (c)_\lambda$. By the compactness theorem, the truth of $(c)_\lambda$ does not depend on λ, hence $(c)_\lambda \implies (d)$.

Main Claim 3.5 Let $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) > |T|$ and let T be a given theory. Then $(a)_\lambda \implies (c)_\lambda$.

Proof of the Main Claim. We are assuming $(a)_\lambda$, so

$$T \text{ is } \triangleleft^{**}_\lambda\text{-maximal.}$$

Stage A. Let $T^n_{\mathrm{tree}} \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathrm{Th}({}^{n\geq}2, <_{\mathrm{tr}})$ for $n < \omega$, where $<=<_{\mathrm{tr}}$ stands for the relation of "being an initial segment of", and let $T_{\mathrm{tree}} \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \lim\langle T^n_{\mathrm{tree}} : n < \omega\rangle$, that is to say, the set of all ψ which are in T^n_{tree} for all large enough n. In order to use $(a)_\lambda$ at a later point, let us fix a theory T^* which is a λ-relevant (T_{tree}, T)-superior with Skolem functions (such a T^* is easily seen to exist), and let $\bar\varphi$, $\bar\psi$ be the interpretations of T_{tree} and T in T^*, respectively. We can without loss of generality, by renaming if necessary, assume that $\mathcal{L}(T) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(T^*)$, so the interpretation $\bar\psi$ is trivial.

As $|T|, |T^*| < \lambda$, we can find $A \subseteq \lambda$ which codes T and T^*. Working in $\mathbf{L}[A]$, we shall define a model M of T^* of size λ as follows. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} T^* &\cup \{\varphi_=(x_\eta, x_\eta) : \eta \in {}^{\lambda>}\lambda\} \\ &\cup \{x_\eta <_\varphi x_\nu : \eta \triangleleft \nu \in {}^{\lambda>}\lambda\} \\ &\{\neg(x_\eta <_\varphi x_\nu) : \neg(\eta \triangleleft \nu) \text{ for } \eta, \nu \in {}^{\lambda>}\lambda)\}.\end{aligned}$$

By a compactness argument and the fact that $\bar\varphi$ interprets T_{tree} in T^*, we see that Γ is consistent. Let M be a model of Γ of size $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ (as we are in $\mathbf{L}[A]$). For $\eta \in {}^{\lambda>}\lambda$ let a_η be the realisation of x_η in M. For $\eta \in {}^{\lambda}\lambda$, let

$$p_\eta(x) \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \{a_{\eta\restriction\alpha} <_\varphi x : \alpha < \lambda\}$$

It is easy to check that each p_η is a (consistent) type, and that for $\eta_0 \neq \eta_1 \in {}^{\lambda}\lambda$, types p_{η_0} and p_{η_1} are contradictory. Let

$$p'_\eta = \{d <_\varphi x : \text{for some } \alpha < \lambda, a <_\varphi a_{\eta\restriction\alpha}\}.$$

By the axioms of T_{tree}, we have that p_η and p'_η are equivalent. Now we observe that for some $\eta^* \in {}^\lambda\lambda$, the type p'_{η^*} is omitted in M, and p'_{η^*} is not definable in M, i.e. for no formula $\vartheta(y, \bar{z})$ and $\bar{c} \subseteq M$ do we have: for $a \in M$, the following are equivalent: $[a <_\varphi x] \in p'_{\eta^*}$ and $M \models \vartheta[a, \bar{c}]$. Let $p \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} p'_{\eta^*}$ for such a fixed η^*. For $\alpha < \lambda$, let $a_\alpha \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} a_{\eta^* \restriction \alpha}$. We now go back to V and make an observation about M.

Subclaim 3.6 T_{tree} satisfies the following property:

for any formula $\vartheta(x, \bar{y})$ we have that $T_{\mathrm{tree}} \vdash \sigma = \sigma(\vartheta)$, where

$$\sigma \equiv (\forall \bar{y})[[(\forall x_1, x_2))\vartheta(x_1, \bar{y}) \wedge \vartheta(x_2, \bar{y}) \implies x_1 \leq_{\mathrm{tr}} x_2 \vee x_2 \leq_{\mathrm{tr}} x_1)] \\ \implies (\exists z)(\forall x)(\vartheta(x, \bar{y}) \implies x \leq_{\mathrm{tr}} z)].$$

Proof of the Subclaim. Let $\vartheta(x, \bar{y})$ be given. By the definition of T_{tree} we only need to show that $T^n_{\mathrm{tree}} \vdash \sigma$ for all large enough n, which is obvious as for every n the tree ${}^{n\geq}2$ has the top level. $\bigstar_{3.6}$

Hence the interpretation $\bar{\varphi}$ of T_{tree} in T^* satisfies the same statement claimed about T_{tree}. We conclude:

$\otimes$ if $M \prec N$ and p is not realised in N, then there is no $\vartheta(x, \bar{c})$ with $\bar{c} \subseteq N$ such that $\vartheta(a_{\eta^* \restriction \alpha}, \bar{c})$ for all $\alpha < \lambda$ holds, while every two elements of N satisfying $\theta(x, \bar{c})$ are $<_\varphi$-comparable.

Stage B. We shall choose a filtration $\bar{M} = \langle M_i : i < \lambda \rangle$ of M, and an increasing sequence $\langle \alpha_i : i < \lambda \rangle$, requiring:

(a) $M_i \prec M$ and M_i are $\prec$-increasing continuous of size $< \lambda$, with M being the $\bigcup_{i<\lambda} M_i$,

(b) $a_{\alpha_i} \in M_{i+1} \setminus M_i$.

We may note that the branch induced by $\{a_{\alpha_i} : i < \lambda\}$ is the same as the one induced by $\{a_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$. Hence p is realised in any model in which $p'(x) \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \{a_{\alpha_i} <_\varphi x : i < \lambda\}$ is realised (or even the similarly defined type using any unbounded subset of $\{\alpha_i : i < \lambda\}$). Hence, by renaming, without loss of generality we have $\alpha_i = i$ for all $i < \lambda$.

Stage C. At this point we shall use $(\mathrm{a})_\lambda$, which implies that it is not true that $T \trianglelefteq^{**}_\lambda T_{\mathrm{tree}}$. In particular, our M and p do not exemplify this, hence there is N with $M \prec N$ and $||N|| = \lambda$, such that N omits p, but for some $M^{[\bar{\psi}]}$ 1-type q over N, whenever $N \prec N^+$ and N^+ realises q, also N^+ realises p. By $\otimes$, the branch induced by $\{a_{\eta^*} \upharpoonright \alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ is not definable in N, so without loss of generality $N = M$. We can also assume that q is a complete type over $M^{[\bar{\varphi}]}$. Let us now use the choice of q to define for each club E of λ a family of formulae associated with it, and to show that each of these families is inconsistent. We use the abbreviation c.d. for "the complete diagram of".

For any club E of λ we define

$$\Gamma_E \overset{\text{def}}{=} \text{c. d.}(M) \cup q(x) \cup \{\neg(a_i <_\varphi \tau(x, \bar{b})) : i \in E, \tau \text{ a term of } T^*, \bar{b} \subseteq M_i\}.$$

Clearly, for any club E, if Γ_E is consistent then there is a model N in which Γ_E is realised. Identifying any $b \in M$ with its interpretation in N and letting a^* be the interpretation of x from Γ_E, we can assume that N is an elementary extension of M in which q is realised by a^*. As T^* has Skolem functions, we have $M \prec N$. Let N_1 be the submodel of N with universe

$$A^* \overset{\text{def}}{=} M \cup \bigcup_{i \in E} \{\tau(a^*, \bar{b}) : \bar{b} \subseteq M_i \text{ and } \tau \text{ a term of } T^*\}.$$

Clearly, N_1 is closed under the functions of T^*, so $M \subseteq N_1 \subseteq N$. As T^* has Skolem functions, we get that $M \prec N_1 \prec N$. By the third part of the definition of Γ_E, p is omitted. This is in contradiction with our assumptions, as $a^* \in N_1$ realises $q(x)$.

Hence we can conclude

$$\text{for every club } E \text{ of } \lambda, \text{ the set } \Gamma_E \text{ is inconsistent.}$$

Stage D. Now we start our search for a formula which exemplifies that T has the syntactical property from (c)$_\lambda$. In the following definitions, we shall use the expression "an almost branch" or the abbreviation a.b. to stand for a set linearly ordered by $<_\varphi$ (but not necessarily closed under $<_\varphi$-initial segments and not necessarily unbounded). Let

$$\Theta^0_{T^*} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \vartheta(x, y, \bar{z}) : \text{ there is } l = l_\vartheta < \omega \text{ such that} \\ \qquad\qquad \text{for every } M^* \models T^*, a \in M^*, \bar{c} \subseteq M^*, \text{ the set} \\ \qquad\qquad \vartheta(a, y, \bar{c})^{M^*} \text{ is the union of } \leq l \text{ a.b. in} M^{*[\bar{\varphi}]} \end{array} \right\},$$

and let Θ_{T^*} be the set of all $\vartheta(x;\bar{y},\bar{z})$ of the form $\bigvee_{j<n}\vartheta_j(x,y_j,\bar{z}_j)$ for some $\vartheta_0,\dots\vartheta_{n-1}\in\Theta^0_{T^*}$ (where $\bar{y}=\langle y_j : j<n\rangle$ and $\bar{z}=\frown_{j<n}\bar{z}_j$). The formulae in Θ_{T^*} will be called candidates. For every candidate

$$\vartheta(x,\bar{y},\bar{z})\equiv\bigvee_{j<n}\vartheta_j(x,y_j,\bar{z}_j)$$

and a $\bar{\psi}$-formula $\sigma(x,\bar{t})$, we consider the following game $\Game_{n,\sigma,\vartheta}$ (whose definition also depends on our fixed p, q and $\bar{M}$), played by two players $\exists$ and $\forall$. The game starts by $\exists$ playing $\bar{b}^0$ from ${}^{\lg(\bar{z}_0)}M$, then $\forall$ playing $\alpha_0<\lambda$. After that $\exists$ chooses $\beta_0\in(\alpha_0,\lambda)$ and $\bar{b}^1\in{}^{\lg(\bar{z}_1)}M$ such that $\bar{b}^0\in{}^{\lg(\bar{z}_0)}M_{\beta_0}$, after which $\forall$ chooses $\alpha_1<\lambda$ etc., finishing by $\exists$ choosing $\bar{b}^{n-1}\in{}^{\lg(\bar{z}_{n-1})}M$ and $\forall$ choosing α_{n-1}, while $\exists$ chooses $\beta_{n-1}\in(\alpha_{n-1},\lambda)$ such that $\bar{b}^{n-1}\in{}^{\lg(\bar{z}_{n-1})}M_{\beta_{n-1}}$. Player $\exists$ wins this game iff for some $\bar{e}\in{}^{\lg(\bar{t})}M$ we have

$$\sigma(x,\bar{e})\in q \text{ and } M\models(\forall x)[\sigma(x,\bar{e})\implies\vartheta(x,\langle a_{\beta_0},\dots,a_{\beta_{n-1}}\rangle,\frown_{k<n}\bar{b}^k)]. \quad (\otimes_1)$$

(Note: the constants a_{β_k} are from the set $\{a_i : i<\lambda\}$ we chose above.) Observe that every sequence $\langle\alpha_0,\dots\alpha_{n-1}\rangle\in{}^n\lambda$ is an admissible sequence of moves for $\forall$.

We shall show that for some $n\geq 1$ and σ,ϑ, player $\exists$ has a winning strategy in the game $\Game_{n,\sigma,\vartheta}$, where $\vartheta=\bigvee_{j<n}\vartheta_j$ as above. As these are determined games, it suffices to show that for some $n\geq 1$ and σ,ϑ, player $\forall$ does not have a winning strategy. Suppose that this is not the case, arguing in $(\mathcal{H}(\chi),\in,<^*_\chi,\bar{M},p,q)$, where χ is large enough and $<^*_\chi$ is a fixed well ordering of $\mathcal{H}(\chi)$. Fix for a moment (n,σ,ϑ). Player $\forall$ has a winning strategy in $\Game_{n,\sigma,\vartheta}$, which, replacing the ordinals α_l by constants a_{α_l}, can be represented by a sequence of functions $G^l_{n,\sigma,\vartheta}$ for $l<n$ (in $(\mathcal{H}(\chi),\in,<^*_\chi,\bar{M},p,q)$), where for $l<n$, if the play up to time l has been $\bar{b}_0,\alpha_0,\beta_0,\dots,\alpha_{l-1},\beta_{l-1},\bar{b}^l$, then $G^l_{n,\sigma,\vartheta}$ applied to this play is a_{α_l} for the α_l in the choice of player $\forall$. We shall assume that these functions are the $<^*$-first which can act in this manner. Using this and elementarity, we notice that for every n,σ,ϑ the values of $G^l_{n,\sigma,\vartheta}$ take place in M, and that

$$E_0\overset{\text{def}}{=}\{\delta<\lambda : (\forall\sigma,\vartheta)(\forall n)(\forall l<n)[M\cap\ \text{Skolem}_{(\mathcal{H}(\chi),\in,\bar{M},G^l_{n,\sigma,\vartheta})}(M_\delta)=M_\delta]\}$$

is a club of λ (as $|T^*|$, $||M_i||<\lambda$ for all i and $\bar{M}$ is increasing continuous). Let $E\overset{\text{def}}{=}\text{acc}(E_0)$. Consider now the set Γ_E. It is contradictory, so there is a finite subset of it which is contradictory. Hence for some $n_0, n_1, n_2 < \omega$ and formulae $\varrho_l(\bar{d}_l)$ $(l < n_0)$ from the c.d.(M), formulae $\sigma_k(x, \bar{e}_k)$ $(k < n_1) \in q(x)$, ordinals $\delta_0 < \ldots < \delta_{n_2-1} \in E$, a sequence $\langle \bar{b}_{j,l} : j < n_2, l < l_j \rangle$ with $\bar{b}_{j,l} \subseteq M_{\delta_j}$ and terms $\langle \tau_{j,l} : j < n_2, l < l_j \rangle$ of T^*, the following is inconsistent:

$$\bigwedge_{l<n_0} \varrho_l(\bar{d}_l) \wedge \bigwedge_{k<n_1} \sigma_k(x, \bar{e}_k) \wedge \bigwedge_{j<n_2, l<l_j} \neg \left(a_{\delta_j} <_\varphi \tau_{j,l}(x, \bar{b}_{j,l}) \right).$$

As ϱ_l come from the c.d.(M) and $q(x)$ is a complete type over $M^{[\bar{\psi}]}$, we may assume that $n_0 = 1$ and $n_1 = 1$. Note that we must have $n_2 \geq 1$ and that there is no loss of generality in assuming that $\bar{b}_{j,l} = \bar{b}_j$ for all $l < l_j$ for $j < n$. We shall omit the subscript 0 from $\varrho, \bar{d}, \sigma, \bar{e}$. Let $n = n_2$ and let us define $\vartheta_j(x, y_j, \bar{z}_j)$ for $j < n$ by

$$\vartheta_j(x, y_j, \bar{z}_j) \equiv \bigvee_{l<l_j} y_j <_\varphi \tau_{j,l}(x, \bar{z}_j),$$

and let $\vartheta = \bigvee_{j<n} \vartheta_j$. Note that for each j we have that $\vartheta_j \in \Theta^0_{T^*}$, as $<_\varphi$ is a tree order. Hence ϑ is a candidate, $\sigma(x, \bar{e}) \in q(x)$, and since $M \models \varrho[\bar{d}]$ we have

$$M \models (\forall x)[\sigma(x, \bar{e}) \implies \bigvee_{j<n} \vartheta_j(x, a_{\delta_j}, \bar{b}_j)]. \tag{$*$}$$

Now we consider the following play of $\Game_{n,\sigma,\vartheta}$. Let $\exists$ choose $\bar{b}_0$. Recall that $\bar{b}_0 \subseteq M_{\delta_0}$. The strategy $G^0_{n,\sigma,\vartheta}$ of $\forall$ yields an ordinal α_0. By the choice of E_0 we have $\alpha_0 < \delta_0$ and $\bar{b}_0 \in M_{\delta_0}$, so we can let $\exists$ choose $\beta_0 = \delta_0$. Let $\exists$ choose $\bar{b}_1$ and then let $\forall$ choose α_1 according to the strategy, etc. At the end of the play, player $\forall$ should have won (as he/she used the supposed winning strategy), but clearly $(*)$ implies that $\exists$ won, a contradiction.

Stage E. We conclude that (for our $\lambda, \bar{M}, p, q$), for some σ, ϑ and $n \geq 1$ the player $\exists$ has a winning strategy in the game $\Game_{n,\sigma,\vartheta}$, call it *St*. Let us fix $n = n^*, \sigma, \vartheta$, and *St* and use them to get the syntactical property from item $(\mathrm{c})_\lambda$.

For any $\bar{\alpha} = \langle \alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1} \rangle \in {}^n\lambda$, we can let $\langle \bar{b}^{\bar{\alpha}\restriction k}, \beta^{\bar{\alpha}\restriction(k+1)} : k < n \rangle$ be the sequence of moves that $\exists$ plays by following the winning strategy *St* in a play in which $\forall$ plays $\bar{\alpha}$, as the dependence is as marked. Let E be a club of λ

such that if $k \leq n$ and $\alpha_0 < \ldots < \alpha_{k-1} < \delta \in E$, then $\bar{b}^{\langle \alpha_0, \cdots, \alpha_{k-1} \rangle} \in {}^{\lg(\bar{z}_j)} M_\delta$. (Such a club can be found by a method similar to the one used in Stage D). Renaming the M_i and a_i's, we can without loss of generality assume that $E = \lambda$. For $\bar{\alpha} \in {}^n\lambda$ let $\bar{e}^{\bar{\alpha}}$ be such that:

$$M \models \forall x[\sigma(x, \bar{e}^{\bar{\alpha}}) \implies \bigvee_{j<n} \vartheta_j(x, a_{\beta^{\bar{\alpha}\restriction(j+1)}}, \bar{b}_j^{\bar{\alpha}\restriction(j+1)})].$$

Notice that σ is a formula in the language of T. We shall show that σ, together with a conveniently chosen sequence of $\bar{e}_{\bar{\eta}}$'s, exemplifies the property from (c)$_\lambda$. The proof now proceeds similarly to the proof of Main Claim 1.13. Namely

Lemma 3.7 There are sequences

$$\langle N_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\lambda>}\lambda \rangle, \langle h_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\lambda>}\lambda \rangle$$

such that

(i) h_η is an elementary embedding of $M_{lg(\eta)}$ into $\mathfrak{C}_{T^*}$ with range N_η,

(ii) $\nu \trianglelefteq \eta \implies h_\nu \subseteq h_\eta$,

(iii) for $\alpha \neq \beta < \lambda$ and $\eta \in {}^{\lambda>}\lambda$ we have

$$h_{\eta\frown\langle\alpha\rangle}(a_{lg(\eta)}) \perp_\varphi h_{\eta\frown\langle\beta\rangle}(a_{lg(\eta)}),$$

(iv) $N_{\eta_0} \cap N_{\eta_1} = N_{\eta_0 \cap \eta_1}$ for all η_0, η_1.

Proof of the Lemma. This Lemma has the same proof as that of Main Claim 1.13. In the notation of that proof, ignore b_{δ_i}. When defining Γ use

$$\Gamma = \cup_{\alpha<\lambda} \Gamma_0^\alpha \cup \cup_{\alpha<\lambda} \Gamma_3^\alpha \cup \Gamma_4 \cup \Gamma_2^+,$$

where $\Gamma_2^+ = \{x_0^\alpha \perp_\varphi x_0^\beta : \alpha \neq \beta < \lambda\}$ and $\Gamma_0^\alpha, \Gamma_3^\alpha$ and Γ_4 are defined as in the proof of Main Claim 1.13, allowing for the replacement of ${}^{\lambda>}2$ by ${}^{\lambda>}\lambda$ by using $\{\bar{x}^\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ in place of $\{\bar{x}^0, \bar{x}^1\}$. Assumptions on $\Gamma_0^\alpha, \Gamma_2^+$ and Γ_3^α are analogous to the ones we made in that proof. Fact 1.16 still holds, except that we drop the last set from the definition of $r(\bar{x})$. The rest of the proof is the same, recalling that the branch induced by $\{a_i : i < \lambda\}$ is undefinable in M. $\bigstar_{3.7}$

Stage F. For $\eta \in {}^{\lambda}\lambda$, let $h_\eta \overset{\text{def}}{=} \cup_{\alpha<\lambda} h_{\eta\restriction\alpha}$. Let $q_\eta \overset{\text{def}}{=} h_\eta(q)$, hence each q_η is a consistent type. For $\bar{\eta} = \langle \eta_0, \ldots , \eta_{n-1}\rangle$ and $\eta_0 \triangleleft \ldots \triangleleft \eta_{n-1}$ with $lg(\eta_i) = \alpha_i + 1$, let $\bar{e}_{\bar{\eta}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} h_{\eta_{n-1}}(\bar{e}^{\langle\alpha_0,\ldots\alpha_{n-1}\rangle})$.

Suppose now that $\eta \in {}^{\lambda}\lambda$ is given, and consider the set

$$\{\sigma(x, \bar{e}_{\bar{\eta}}) : \bar{\eta} = \langle \eta \restriction (\alpha_0 + 1), \ldots \eta \restriction (\alpha_{n-1} + 1)\rangle \text{ for some } \alpha_0 < \ldots \alpha_{n-1} < \lambda\}.$$

This set is a subset of q_η, and is hence consistent. This proves property (α) from $(\mathrm{c})_\lambda$. For (β), let m be large enough and $g : {}^{n\geq}m \to {}^{\lambda>}\lambda$ be as in the statement of (β). For $\rho \in {}^{n}m$ let $\bar{e}_{g_\rho} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \bar{e}_{\langle g(\rho\restriction 1),\ldots g(\rho)\rangle}$ (note that this is always defined). We shall now show that the set

$$\{\sigma(x, \bar{e}_{g_\rho}) : \rho \in {}^{n}m\}$$

is inconsistent. Suppose otherwise, so let $d \in \mathfrak{C}_{T^*}$ realise it. For each $\rho \in {}^{n}m$, let $\eta_\rho \in {}^{\lambda}\lambda \supseteq g(\rho)$ and let $\bar{\alpha}^\rho \overset{\text{def}}{=} \langle \alpha^\rho_0, \ldots , \alpha^\rho_{n-1}\rangle$ satisfy $lg(g(\rho \restriction k)) = \alpha^\rho_k + 1$ for $k \leq n$, so for each $k < n$ we have $g(\rho \restriction (k + 1)) = \eta_\rho \restriction (\alpha^\rho_k + 1)$. Now we have that for each $\rho \in {}^{n}m$

(i) $\sigma(x, \bar{e}_{g_\rho}) \equiv \sigma(x, h_{\eta_\rho\restriction(\alpha^\rho_{n-1}+1)}(\bar{e}^{\bar{\alpha}^\rho})) \in q_{\eta_\rho} \restriction \sigma_{\eta_\rho}(x)$

(ii) $N_{\eta_\rho} \models (\forall x)[\sigma(x, \bar{e}_{g_\rho}) \implies \vartheta(x, \langle h_{\eta_\rho}(a_{\beta^{\bar{\alpha}^\rho\restriction 1}}), \ldots h_{\eta_\rho}(a_{\beta^{\bar{\alpha}^\rho}})\rangle, \frown_{j<n} h_{\eta_\rho}(\bar{b}^{\bar{\alpha}^\rho_j}))]$
(hence the same holds in $\mathfrak{C}_{T^*}$),

(iii)

$$\vartheta(x, \langle h_{\eta_\rho}(a_{\beta^{\bar{\alpha}^\rho\restriction 1}}), \ldots h_{\eta_\rho}(a_{\beta^{\bar{\alpha}^\rho}})\rangle, \frown_{j<n} h_{\eta_\rho}(\bar{b}^{\bar{\alpha}^\rho_j})) \implies \bigvee_{j<n} \vartheta_j(x, h_{\eta_\rho}(a_{\beta^{\bar{\alpha}^\rho\restriction(j+1)}}), h_{\eta_\rho}(\bar{b}^{\bar{\alpha}^\rho_j}))$$

for our $\vartheta_0, \ldots \vartheta_{n-1}$.

For each $\rho \in {}^{n}m$ let $j(\rho) < n$ be the first such that

$$\vartheta_j(d, h_{\eta_\rho}(a_{\beta^{\bar{\alpha}^\rho\restriction(j+1)}}, h_{\eta_\rho}(\bar{b}^{\bar{\alpha}^{\rho\restriction(j+1)}})))$$

holds. Let $l^* = \max\{l_0, \ldots , l_{n-1}\}$.

As m is large enough, there are $\rho_0, \ldots , \rho_{l^*} \in {}^n m$ such that $j(\rho_s) = j^*$ for all $s \in \{0, \ldots , p\}$, while $\rho_s \restriction j^*$ is fixed and $\rho_s(j^*) \neq \rho_t(j^*)$ for $s \neq t \leq l^*$. (We use that there is a full ${}^{l^*+1\geq}n$ subtree t^* of ${}^{n\geq}m$ such that for all $\rho \in t^* \cap {}^n m$ we have $j(\rho) = j^*$. Choose ρ_s belonging to t^* and splitting at the level j^*). In particular, $\alpha_0^{\rho_s} = \alpha_0, \ldots , \alpha_{j^*-1}^{\rho_s} = \alpha_{j^*-1}$ is fixed, and so is $h_{\eta_{\rho_s}} \restriction M_{\alpha_j^*+1}$, but

$$g(\rho_s) \restriction (\alpha_{j^*-1} + 2) \text{ for } s \leq l^* \text{ are incomparable in } {}^\lambda\lambda. \tag{$**$}$$

Let $\bar{\alpha} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \bar{\alpha}^{\rho_0}$.

For each $\rho \in {}^n m$ and $k < n$ we have that $\bar{b}^{\bar{\alpha}^{\rho\restriction(k+1)}} \in M_{\alpha^\rho_{k+1}}$ (by the choice of E), so in particular $\bar{b}^{\bar{\alpha}^{\rho\restriction j^*}} \in M_{\alpha^\rho_{j^*+1}}$, and hence $h_{\eta_{\rho_s}}(\bar{b}^{\bar{\alpha}^{\rho\restriction j^*}})$ is a fixed $\bar{b}^*$. By the choice of d and definitions of j^*, l^* and Θ_{T^*}, there are $s \neq t < l_{\vartheta_{j^*}} \leq l^*$ such that $h_{\eta_{\rho_s}}(a_{\beta^{\bar{\alpha}^{\rho_s\restriction(j^*+1)}}})$ and $h_{\eta_{\rho_t}}(a_{\beta^{\bar{\alpha}^{\rho_t\restriction(j^*+1)}}})$ are on the same almost branch. Now note that for all ρ we have $a_{\beta^{\bar{\alpha}^{\rho\restriction(j^*+1)}}} \in M_{\beta^{\bar{\alpha}^{\rho\restriction(j^*+1)}}+1} \setminus M_{\beta^{\bar{\alpha}^{\rho\restriction(j^*+1)}}}$ and $\beta^{\bar{\alpha}^{\rho\restriction(j^*+1)}} > \alpha^\rho_{j^*}$. Hence $h_{\eta_{\rho_s}}(a_{\beta^{\bar{\alpha}^{\rho_s\restriction(j^*+1)}}})$ and $h_{\eta_{\rho_t}}(a_{\beta^{\bar{\alpha}^{\rho_t\restriction(j^*+1)}}})$ are incomparable, by property (iii) in Lemma 3.7, a contradiction. This shows (β) from $(\mathrm{c})_\lambda$, hence we have finished the proof of $(\mathrm{a})_\lambda \implies (\mathrm{c})_\lambda$. $\bigstar_{3.5}$

$\bigstar_{3.4}$

Question 3.8 (1) Are the implications in Main Theorem 3.4 actually equivalences?
(2) Are $\triangleleft^*$ and $\triangleleft^{**}$ equivalent?
(3) What is the connection of the property in $(\mathrm{c})_\lambda$ with the NSOP hierarchy?

References

[DjSh 614] M. Džamonja and S. Shelah, *On the existence of universals and an application to Banach spaces and triangle free graphs*, to appear in the Israel Journal of Mathematics.

[DjSh 659] M. Džamonja and S. Shelah, *Universal graphs at the successor of singular*, submitted.

[HaLa] J.D. Halpern, H. Lauchli, *A Partition Theorem*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, vol. 124, Issue 2 (Aug. 1966), pg. 360-367.

[Ke] H. J. Keisler, *Six classes of theories*, Journal of Australian Mathematical Society 21 (1976), 257-275.

[Ki] B. Kim and A. Pillay, *Simple theories*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, 88 (2-3) (1997), 149-164 .

[KjSh 409] M. Kojman and S. Shelah, *Nonexistence of universal orders in many cardinals*, Journal of Symbolic Logic 57 (1992), 875-891.

[KjSh 447] M. Kojman and S. Shelah, *The universality spectrum of stable unsuperstable theories*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, 1992.

[Sh c] S. Shelah, *Classification theory and the number of nonisomorphic models*, vol. 92 of Studies in Logic and the Foundation of Mathematics, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1990.

[Sh 457] S. Shelah, *The Universality Spectrum: Consistency for more classes* in *Combinatorics, Paul Erdös is Eighty*, Vol. 1, 403-420, Bolyai Society Mathematical Studies, 1993, Proceedings of the Meeting in honor of P. Erdös, Keszthely, Hungary 7. 1993, an improved version available at http://www.math.rutgers.edu/~shelaharch

[Sh 500] S. Shelah, *Toward classifying unstable theories*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic 80 (1996) 229-255.